O.P. Sent to R.R.L. 7/9/28

REFERENCE LIBRARY OF

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

2 PARK STREET, BOSTON

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE SHELVES
EXCEPT BY PERMISSION OF
THE LIBRARIAN

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection

This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS

BY

EDMUND NOBLE

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
The Riverside Press Cambridge

COPYRIGHT, 1900, BY EDMUND NOBLE
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

NOTE

THE works utilized in the preparation of this Sketch include a number of volumes in English, French, German, and Russian. In order to avoid extending the list to the dimensions of a bibliography, mention is made only of the more important works in Russian which have been consulted. They include: Soloviév's encyclopedic *Istóriya Rossíi s Drevnéishikh Vremén* ("History of Russia from the Earliest Times"), in six volumes, St. Petersburg, 1895; also his *Obshchedostúpniya Chténiya o Russkóy Istórii* ("Popular Readings in Russian History"), Moscow, 1895; Ustryálov's *Rússkaya Istóriya* ("Russian History"), and *Istóriya Tsarstvovániya Petrá Velíkago* ("History of the Reign of Peter the Great"); Belyaiev's *Rússkaya Istóriya do Refórmy Petrá Velíkago* ("Russian History up to the Reforms of Peter the Great"), St. Petersburg, 1895; Ilováisky's *Istóriya Rossíi* ("Russian History"), Moscow, 1876; I. I. Semevsky's *Ócherky i Raskazy iz Rússkoy Istorii* ("Sketches and Stories from Russian History"); N. I. Kostomárov's *Ócherk Do-*

máshnei Zhízni i Nrávov Velíkago Rússkago Naróda v xvi i xvii Stolétiyakh ("Sketch of the Domestic Life and Manners of the Great-Russian People in the 16th and 17th Centuries"); Mordovtsev's *Rússkiya Zhénshchiny* ("Russian Women"), in three volumes, and *Rússkiya Istorícheskiya Zhénshchiny* ("Russian Historical Women"); Milyukóv's *Ócherki po Istórii Rússkoy Kultury* ("Sketches of the History of Russian Culture"), St. Petersburg, 1896, and *Glávniya Techéniya Rússkoy Istorícheskoy Mysli* ("The Chief Currents of Russian Historical Ideas"), Moscow, 1898; Dzhánshiev's *Epókha Velíkikh Refórm* ("Epoch of the Great Reforms"); and various histories of Russian Literature by Polevóy, Pypin, Skabichévsky, and others.

In the transliteration of Russian words the English spelling has been for the most part followed. The *a* is pronounced as in "father;" *e* as in "men;" *o* as in "tone;" *u* as in "root;" *i* as in "need." The *ch* is sounded as in "church;" *sh* as in "wish;" *kh* (guttural) as in German "Ich." The Russian letter which some transliterate *ui* is here rendered by *y*, as in "story." For the *ff* at the end of many proper names the more accurate *v* is substituted. All the Russian words used have been transliterated according to their spelling

in Russian. A phonetic rendering has not been attempted, since the language itself is not phonetic. The initial *O* of words, as well as the *o* in first syllables, frequently takes the sound of *a:* thus *Oká* is pronounced *Aká; Orlóv — Arlóv; otéchestvo* ("fatherland") — *atéchestvo; Domostróy — Damastróy; Románov — Ramánov; Borís — Barís; boyárin — bayárin.* The *e* in closing syllables sometimes has the sound of *yo* in "yoke:" thus *pravézh* is pronounced *pravyózh; Muraviév — Muravyóv; Soloviév — Solovyóv; Tolstóy — Talstóy.* The final *g* of words is usually guttural, as in the case of *Olég*, pronounced *Alékh*, though in *Olga* the *O* has the same sound as in English. When *z* ends a word, it is pronounced like *ss*, as in *prikáz — prikáss*, and *ukáz — ukáss.* Pronounce *Kiev — Kee-ev;* and *Tourguéneff — Turgéniev.*

E. N.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. The Land and the People	1
II. Laying the Foundations	23
III. How Russia became an Autocracy	40
IV. Peter the Great and "Europeanization"	59
V. The Women Reformers	84
VI. Revolt of the "Decembrists"	102
VII. Emancipation of the Peasants	123
VIII. "Nihilism" and the Revolutionary Movement	140
IX. The Religious Protest	159
X. The Story of Russian Expansion	179
XI. Siberia and the Exile System	201
XII. Language and Literature	227
XIII. The Russian Future	254

RUSSIA AND THE RUSSIANS

I

THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE

Russia, in the popular view of it, is regarded as a far-away country of but remote interest for all save a few of the western nations with whom it maintains more or less close political relations. We ourselves are apt to think of it, when we give it a thought, in terms of one or other of those conventional judgments which the world at large passes upon communities that from time to time compel its attention, but which it never thoroughly understands. Nor does travel always enlighten us as to the value for our culture processes of a knowledge of this long isolated empire in the European northeast. Extend our journey through Russia as we will, we seem ever to find ourselves in few and poorly developed urban communities, with their increasing proletariat, where poverty, intemperance, and sanitary neglect go hand in hand, and where the distance between the impecunious classes

and the rich seems to grow greater year by year; in an empire of peasants where the land yields but a sorry subsistence to the people who cultivate it, — people in whose minds superstition has more or less usurped the place left vacant by education — and amid a general population of over a hundred million souls who continue to be held by a church-supported autocracy in a condition of political serfdom. It is hardly wonder that from such mediæval conditions as these we should return from our trip disappointed, and with our minds made up that, however it may be with other countries of Europe, Russia at least has nothing to teach us. Yet such a judgment is premature, and the degree of its inadequacy we can know only through a study of the country and its people much more profound than the tourist usually cares to undertake in his preparations for travel abroad. We have but, in fact, fairly to grasp something of the meaning of the strange vicissitudes and unique processes which make up the problem, to be led to recognize that the story of Russia, instead of lacking in interest and value, offers one of the most instructive examples of race development, of nation building, and of ethnic expansion recorded in history.

The Russian Slavs first became known to contemporaries soon after the beginning of the Christian era. The various physical and ethnic charac-

ters which they then revealed enable us to connect them at once, not only with the Slav stock, but also with the people who were to succeed them in various parts of European Russia. They were, for example, men of robust physique, with eyes ranging in color from blue to gray, with hair auburn, yellowish, or chestnut — characters which harmonize well as a means of identification with the closely-fitting trousers, the short blouse, and the high boots seen on the Scythian ornaments unearthed from the steppe tombs in Southern Russia, and now displayed in the Museum of the Hermitage at St. Petersburg.

In addition to these physical traits, the Russian Slavs brought with them into their new settlements various social and mental characteristics. Their religious system was a highly developed nature worship, based on a generalized conception which associated light with good, and darkness with evil, under circumstances of that conflict between the two which has supplied the foundation for innumerable myths. The supreme deity was *Svaróg* or *Nébo* (Sky). From the bright heaven thus personified, as the Greeks personified it in Zeus, shone *Sólntse* (Sun), otherwise *Vólos*, the solar deity. In stormy weather, when the lightning broke, it was *Perún* who hurled the shaft and let loose the thunderbolt. *Ogón* meanwhile ruled

over fire and flame, while *Stríbog* released or constrained the tempestuous winds. But *Perún* is sometimes used interchangeably with *Svaróg* when the creative power of the supreme deity is meant, the word being a derivation from the Lithuanian *perieti*, "to give birth," "to produce warmth." In this way, *Svaróg-Perún* is said to have given birth to *Sólntse* (*Vólos*) the solar deity, and also to *Ogón*, the fire god. Related to this function of the supreme deity, with suggestions of a much more primitive attitude towards the environment, is the fact that the earth was worshiped under the title of Mother Earth (*Mat Zemlyá*) with an added epithet (*syráya*) signifying "damp," "humid," in the sense of "quick," "live." The functions of the Greek Vulcan are at times attributed to *Perún*, who is thus made the patron of armies. So, by a similar extension of functions, *Vólos* becomes the protector of cattle, and *Stríbog* the patron of warriors. The solar deity in the narrower sense was *Dazh-Bog*, and to him the Slavs also gave the general overlordship of nature. *Moróz* (Frost) brought the dreadful chills of winter; *Moréna* presided over the phenomena of death. The ancient hymns sing of *Kupálo* or *Yarílo*, god of the summer sun, and of *Did-Ládo*, the goddess of fecundity. To Slav mythology also belong various subordinate per-

sonifications in the characters of heroes, giants, dragon-killers, centaurs, and vampires, together with a host of wood-spirits, water-spirits, river-spirits, and house-spirits. The Slavs had no temples; they usually worshiped in the forest, or on some hill made sacred to *Perún*. Nor was the institution of the priesthood known to them, religious rites being performed by the elder or chief of the tribe for the time being. They believed in the life after death, and were in the habit of placing weapons, as well as food, in the graves of the departed.

The Russian Slavs had a social organization similar to that which has been found to exist in other parts of Europe. It rested on the patriarchal principle of the absolute power of the father as head of the family. A number of families formed the *mir*, or commune, the affairs of which were administered by a council made up of the various family elders. The individual member of the tribe possessed the "court," or patch of land which surrounded his dwelling; the land which he cultivated was the property of the commune. By combining several adjacent communes, the tribes formed a larger organization, known as the *volost*, or canton, the affairs of which were managed by a council composed of the elders of the individual communes, one of whom was chosen chief.

The Russian Slavs were a kind-hearted, benevolent people. Their chief occupation was agriculture. They knew how to make iron tools, and were familiar with such metals as gold, silver, and copper. The art of weaving was practiced by them; they kept bees, and understood how to make fermented liquors. They were all the same a deeply religious people. Their domestic life was characterized by a remarkable development of hospitality — a virtue of great social importance in an age when, owing to the great distances, the traveler was absent from his home for many days. The Russians lived in huts at some distance from each other. They had no villages, towns, or cities; yet for the purpose of council they made use of certain earthen fortifications to which also they retired with their families in time of peril. When attacked by an enemy, they could use the sword, the buckler, the spear, the javelin, and sometimes the poisoned arrow with considerable effect. Expert in forming ambuscades, they also excelled in the boldness of their onslaught when it had to be made in the open. Fighting there without the precautions which military knowledge would dictate, they scorned the direction of a leader, and threw themselves upon the enemy in the loose order of a mob rather than in closely ranked column, each man acting upon the inspiration of

the moment. As warriors, they were brave as well as self-reliant; the courage with which they fought has been highly praised. Yet the boundless love of liberty which, as Karamzin tells us, they cherished, was in nothing carried to a more imprudent extreme than in their political arrangements. It was, in fact, this excessive individualism, one of the most genuine and easily distinguishable race traits of the Russian Slavs, which long interposed an insuperable obstacle to their progress as a race. With their moral qualities still undeveloped, lacking the restraint and self-discipline necessary to the building of a state, they had to acquire from the foreigner the power to coöperate for the purposes of a truly national life.

In the early period, the Russian land was an irregular patch of territory reaching from the site now occupied by Voronezh on the east to the borders of Prussia, and from a point just north of Nóvgorod to the Carpathian mountains. Today it has an outlook upon the Baltic, stretches its southern coast lines as far as the Black and Caspian Seas, and in the north holds an immense frontage along the Arctic Ocean. Once restricted to about one fifth of the territory we now know as European Russia, the Slavonia which the centuries have thus transformed spans the planet westward to the Pacific, and does this with a larger con-

tinuous dominion than has fallen to the lot of any other power. An expansion thus phenomenal may be well worth Humboldt's magniloquent comparison of its extent to the visible surface of the full moon. To its manifold benefits, nevertheless, belong certain disadvantages of serious political and strategic import. The stimulating influences of the colonizing process doubtless saved the Russian Slav from the degeneration which, sooner or later, overtakes all merely sessile races. But colonization in the east of Europe has been wholly a land movement: it has called forth none of the characters of nations whose chief role in history has been that of maritime conquest. And this for a double reason, for while nature gave the Russians an enormous stretch of territory to invade, she denied them that command of the sea which we are apt to associate with all true national greatness. A glance at the map shows her everywhere tantalizingly in sight of the ocean without possessing any real control over it. The Black and Caspian seas are to-day inland lakes, the latter being absolutely isolated, the former accessible only through a difficult channel, open or closed at the will of the power dominant in Constantinople. Ice makes the upper Baltic unnavigable during nearly eight months of every year; moreover, the passage through it into the North Sea is at any time at the mercy of the

power commanding the straits between Denmark and Sweden. So far as the Pacific outlet is concerned, we can estimate its strategic value by remembering its northern situation and extreme distance from the heart of the empire.

The mountains of Russia, again, are much too insignificant to have any direct culture importance attributed to them. The series of elevations known as the Valdái, some one thousand feet high, constitute the insignificant orographical feature of the European division. Nor do the more important Siberian ranges make of Russia a mountainous country, or entitle us to describe the characters of Russian civilization as having been in any sense determined by the influence of a mountainous environment. The bulk of them exist where the population is thinnest — the only territory in Russia which suggests the culture-forming influence of Switzerland is that of the Caucasus, and here the occupation is by non-Slav populations.

The climate of Russia has a well-marked continental character, with extremes of temperature which surprise the traveler accustomed to the milder seasons and more gradual transitions of western Europe. The openness of the country to the north wind, the lack of modifying influences from the Gulf Stream, make the winter of Russia, even in southern latitudes, one of extreme rigor;

on the other hand, a well-nigh tropical temperature may be experienced in July as far north as St. Petersburg, which has the highest latitude of any capital in Europe. From the absence of atmospheric moisture, which mountains contribute so much to develop, Russia suffers much, the prevailing dryness of the country increasing, as we should expect, from west to east, to the considerable lowering of the fertility of large regions. Yet the Russian plain, well-nigh horizontal throughout its entire length, enjoys the advantages of a well-ramified water system, which has been of enormous importance for the interests of national development. Its great rivers are of historic significance, and they bless the territories they traverse with no niggardly volume — the Dniepr, associated with Kiev, with the conversion of the Russians to Christianity, and with the early voyages to Constantinople; the Volga, "mother" of Russian waters, the great hydrographic artery of the expanding empire whose centre was Moscow; then, finally — to say nothing of many minor streams — the Neva, linked inseparably with the work of Peter the Great, and with the European period of Russian history.

The European territories of Russia, with their distinct zones, though well defined by natural conditions, constitute a continuous system. The ab-

sence of mountain chains and valleys, which work to the segregation of life, and to its separation into distinct types, favors the natural unification of the land, and prepared it, so to speak, for the commercial relations which were finally set up between each economic region and all the rest. The prevailing unity of conditions also contributes to the homogeneity of the people who make such a continent their home. The likeness of climate, the presence of vast territories of cultivable soil differing little in the treatment required, must also be taken into account as among the influences tending to produce likeness of physical type, through generically common activities, as well as, in some sort, likeness in social life and ideas.

Emphasis has already been laid upon the relational significance of Russia's inconsiderable frontage to the ocean. This lack of maritime experience has an inner meaning of no little importance. For the peoples of western Europe the open ocean was either an irresistible lure, perpetually stimulating to enterprise and adventure, or a rude assailant whose destructive moods schooled men to the temper, while it trained them to the habit of resistance. To southern Europe nature has given the deeply indented shore lines whose connecting Mediterranean waters had so fateful an influence not only upon the course of history, but also upon

the development of human thought. Some, at least, of the western peoples drew from a mountainous surrounding, with its altitude, its variety, its inaccessibility, not only independence of spirit, but also originality of mind. What might not be expected from nations nurtured by the "mighty voices," as Wordsworth calls them, of sea and mountain? But the Russians were not thus favored. With the same nature for a nurse, another cradle was to be theirs — they were to be crooned over by another music. Their home for centuries was to be the boundless plain, with its far-off horizons; it was amid the soughing of the forests, the sighing of the steppe, that they were to grow to their maturity as a people.

But they were not to be in any considerable degree a sessile race. Their early experiences, if the Aryan legend be true, had implanted within their veins the migrating instinct; it had needed only the magic touch of the Varyágs to start them on the march. Westward they could not go; a west already settled forbade it. But to the east there were tribes and peuplades with but slight tenure upon the soil; agricultural races like the Finns, who lent themselves easily to absorption, or nomad peoples that needed only the thrust of a virile nationality to be pushed back into Central Asia, if not swept from the map altogether. The

stimulus to expansion must have come no less from the tree-clad north than from the open steppes of the south land; the forest enabled them to hold against all-comers the territories they won; the unobstructed plain provided facilities for movement which made it the historic marching ground of the nation.

It is to some extent because of the lateness and rapidity of her expansion, thus consummated over land, that we look to Russia in vain for any early or considerable urban development. A people constantly on the march cannot pause often or long enough by the way to build up that splendid array of cities which constitutes so characteristic a feature of west-European civilization. Yet it was conditions more potent than the horizontality of her plains, than the migrating tendencies of her people, which for many centuries held Russia a stage nearer than her western neighbors to the nomad life which it was her destiny to displace. The presence of an enormous extent of soil suited to agriculture, the economic needs of an increasing population fitted only to gain its livelihood from the soil, and the sum total of the conditions which, perpetuating the peasant class, isolated it permanently from the culture, as well as from the state of well-being which cities make possible, if they do not always insure — it is causes like these which

have deprived Russia of those opportunities of a well-developed urban life that are indispensable to the growth of free institutions. And it is this deprivation which must have had far more influence in accustoming the masses of the Russian people to the idea of political subjection, in extending their tolerance of autocratic power, than any which could be exerted by the local circumstances of a personal lot, however difficult, or by the tyranny of an impersonal climate, however rigorous or long-continued.

So much for the natural surroundings. What now of the human environment? The Russian Slavs had settled in a territory already occupied; in pushing out to the north, the south, and the east, they came into collision with three distinct peoples. To the west, in territories bordering the Baltic, were the Letto-Lithuanians, a tribe of Indo-European speech. The regions to the north and northeast were occupied by the Finns, an Uralo-Altaic race, with numerous branches. The southeast country was mostly held by the Khazárs, also Finnish, and by Turkic tribes known as the Pechenégs and Pólovtsy. The northern Finns here described were for the most part passively absorbed before the advancing wave of Russian colonization; the bulk of the active resistance to the movement came from the east and the southeast, where the Turko-

Finnic peoples, being recent immigrants, were always in a state of fermentation. Here the Khazárs were first encountered. Then the historic rôle of opposition fell to the Pechenégs. But, by the eleventh century, this tribe having pushed its way to the borders of the Black Sea, the struggle of the Russian princes is mainly with the Pólovtsy. When the fourteenth century is reached, the pack has been again shuffled, and there is a new deal. Khazárs, Bolgars, Pechenégs, and Pólovtsy have all disappeared beneath the black shadow of the Tatar-Mongol invasion, which now covers with its eclipse the whole east of European Russia.

The chief result of all these contacts and minglings was that profound modification which, fusing Slav with Finnish elements, created the homogeneous race stock which we to-day call Great-Russian. The influence of the Finn admixture appears in the large, bony frame, the high cheek-bones and sallow tint, in the acquired peculiarities of dress, manners, and customs, but, with especial noteworthiness, in the intellectual and moral traits of the modified people. The Great-Russians emerge from their contact with the Uralo-Altaic races with more solidity of character, greater power of endurance, and a degree of perseverance and enterprise which they did not originally possess — with race traits, in a word, which

differentiate them in a striking way from the otherwise gifted, but more lively and variable, Poles and Little-Russians, the latter of whom, by the way, were much less radically modified as a result of their contact with the Tatar peoples of the southeast.

Not less important, if more extended in time, was the culture assimilation of Russia. In the matter of religion, excluding the sectarians, this process may be said to have completed itself for the masses of the people. It is true that the Christianity they embraced so early as the tenth century came to them from Constantinople, and was thus weighted with political elements which the rest of Europe had already or has since outgrown. The *fille décrépite de la vieille Rome*, as Duruy calls the eastern capital, could contribute little of value, beyond the mere rudiments of an educational system, to the secular upbuilding of the Russian state. The faith, moreover, which satisfied the masses of the people in the early period of the national existence has proved in modern times impressively inadequate to the needs of the educated, and probably of the bulk of the class known in Russia as cultured. And it is now become more than ever evident that if Russian civilization benefitted from the Byzantine influence, it did so because it was Christian, and not because it was Byzantine.

The social assimilation of Russia to the west — an assimilation in ways of living, dress, ceremonial, etiquette — was a gradual and secular process which could only unfold its full activity in and subsequent to the time of Peter the Great. Yet in spite of it Russia has remained through the larger part of her history effectively isolated from the culture of Europe. The consequent retardation of the nation's development in its intellectual phase has given to Russian history some of its most peculiar and most interesting characters. The causes of this deprivation are not far to seek. It was natural at the outset that the face of a nation continually expanding westward should be as constantly turned in that direction. But the Russian Slavs were looking also towards Byzantium, from which they had received not only their faith, but also their secular instruction. In embracing Byzantine Christianity, in adopting a religious system antipathetic to their Slav congeners of Polish nationality, who were of the Roman Catholic faith, they closed up the main line of expansion which western culture would otherwise have taken. Some part of the estrangement of Russia from Europe must be attributed to geographical position; the larger effect was undoubtedly produced not only by religion, but also by language.

The influence of Russian speech was wholly isolating. Even when its words have been transliterated into Latin equivalents, the elements disclosed are found, on the whole, and with the exception of a few simple terms, to present few of those likenesses which, connecting words belonging to other and distinct members of the Indo-European family, make an acquaintance with one of these languages a means to the easy acquirement of all the rest. And when to the obstacle of the nature of the Russian words themselves was added the obscuring influence of the script, — of the strange characters in which such words are written and printed, — the chasm thus created between Russian and west-European modes of thought became, for all ordinary purposes of international intercourse, impassable. After the invention of printing, it was the visible affinities of language rather than the hidden and abstract affinities of race upon which the whole intellectual solidarity of the peoples of west Europe finally rested. The Poles and southern Slavs had the good fortune to connect their culture with that of the west, through books and newspapers printed in Roman letters; compared with the value of this instrument of assimilation, the type of Christianity they adopted was of minor importance. The Russian Slav had no such compensation. By receiving his faith from

Constantinople rather than from Rome, he bound himself to models of literature and types of political conduct dictated from Byzantium; by clothing his Indo-European speech in the worn-out garments of Ecclesiastical Slavonic, he severed his people from the currents of western thought with a barrier more formidable than any mountain chain, more unrelenting than any imperial ukaz.

The wholly special character of Russian history, and not a little of its peculiar interest, come from just this separation from the west which physical situation, Greek faith, and language combined to maintain. It is only when we think of the peoples of western Europe talking languages mutually intelligible, or so related as to be easily acquired, that we begin to appreciate how much the Russians lost from their exclusion, — not from the religious wars of the sixteenth century, nor yet from the Crusades, or from the struggle between the papal and the civil power, but from the intellectual movement which swept through the west, reinvigorating every department of human thought, and carrying the tide of its results even as far as the temples and cathedrals of Moscow, yet leaving there no more than the outward show of a renaissance which elsewhere seemed to recreate the inner life of individual and of nation. Unconnected with the joyous ebullition of feeling which gave rise to German

minnesinger and French *troubadour;* sharing little in the burst of genius which filled all the western countries with the names of Michael Angelo, Raphael, Correggio; without part in the literary revival that made common European property of the writings of Dante and Ariosto and Tasso in Italy, of Cervantes and Lope de Vega and Calderon in Spain, of Camoëns in Portugal, and of Shakespeare in England, — the Russians could make none of the contributions to human thought and progress which elsewhere came not from any individual people, but from the European family of nations, none the less unified by common intellectual interests because politically so far apart.

If the young Slavonia was ill fitted to play the part of nurse to the physical sciences, still less prepared was she to act as the midwife of philosophy. Achievements like the discovery of printing, the invention of the telescope, were for the European, not for the Russian intellect. From the trading republics of Nóvgorod, Vyatka, and Pskov successful merchants might go forth in hundreds, but the enterprise developed was necessarily of a kind other than that which gave to the world its great navigators, headed by Columbus, or turned its attention to the vaster cosmic revelations of a Copernicus, a Kepler, or a Galileo. Even in education the Russian people were denied that solidar-

ity of culture which was secured to the countries of Europe by the university system as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was this living contact of nation with nation which, by preserving the continuity of the Græco-Roman culture, made each of its inheritors a collaborator in the civilization of all the rest. And it was the absence of it that helped to keep Russia, throughout the period of her youth, under the tutelage of an eastern culture that satisfied her religious longings without yielding scope for her intellectual development.

The course of the narrative will reveal some of the results of this enforced retardation. We shall learn, for example, that, belonging to it by all the higher activities of her life, Russia could not remain permanently separated from the west. We shall also recognize why the movement of assimilation, when it finally broke in full tide upon the Russians, should take the form of a violent reaction in which all arrears of past neglect had to be paid up in full. And we shall discover that the attitude of Russia towards western culture since the time of Peter the Great has been neither the willful disloyalty to national ideals, of which the Slavophils accuse her, nor yet the mere absorptive eagerness of a half-Asiatic race, which is ready to receive and assimilate anything, provided only that it is

foreign, but rather — for those who can look deeply enough — the effort of a great people to enter fully into its intellectual heritage, with just such appearance of haste as any rebounding movement of national recovery from unnatural stress would be likely to show.

II

LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS

THE first suggestion of the romance there is in Russian history comes to us at the outset of our narrative. We find it, if anywhere, in those humble circumstances wherein the builders of this empire of "a thousand years," as Bayard Taylor called it nearly half a century ago, cast about them for the foundations on which they were to work. A glance suffices to show that the conditions in which they found themselves were most unfavorable for the development of a strong and durable national life. Their lot had been cast in the great plains of northeastern Europe; here it was that from the fifth to the ninth century they had lived through successive periods of subjection, first to one and then to another of the semi-barbaric populations who occupied that part of the world. The Goths had first oppressed them; the Avars or Obrovs next became their masters; finally, on the retirement of the Avars into Pannonia, they had come more or less under the power of the Khazárs. The appearance of the Pechenégs, rivals of the

Khazárs, brought them in the ninth century a new lease of freedom, and it is amid the last traces of their subjection to the Khazárs that the history of the Russians properly begins.

The condition of the eastern branch of Slavs was then unpromising in the extreme. Through all the vicissitudes described — changes involving enormous racial displacements — they had emerged not only without important change of geographical position, but also without the manifestation of any sign of political growth. They not only lacked the consciousness of national unity, but were also wanting in the qualities which were to make it possible. Willing enough to submit to rule in their communes and *volosti*, they had refused to subordinate themselves to any general leadership, until the very conception of it had become antipathetic. What they now needed, after centuries of exaggerated individualism, was the impulse that should enable them to forget their mutual differences and private dissensions in the sense of the common welfare, — should convert their loosely cohering tribes into a nation, and thus enable them to cast off the last relics of their subjection to the barbarous east. This impulse could come only from without, and it came from the Varyágs, a tribe or people of Scandinavian origin, with whose organizing talent and military prowess they were already familiar.

The Varyágs were called in the latter half of the ninth century. The invitation was extended immediately by the Slavs settled about Nóvgorod, and from these as also representing the Finnish Chuds, Kriviches and Vesses, with whom, at the time, they were more or less in alliance. The northerners had consulted together and formed a decision for themselves. "Let us seek out for ourselves princes," they had said to each other, "who will rule over us and judge according to law." So, in 862, the men of Nóvgorod sent over sea to the Varyágs, saying: "Our land is large and rich, but there is no order in it. Come and be our princes, and rule over us." Three brothers, we are told by Nestor, responded to the summons, — Rurik, Sineus, and Truvor, — but the early death of Sineus and Truvor soon left Rurik sole ruler of the Russian country. It was under his administration that the Slav tribes came to be definitely known to foreigners as *Russi*, or Russians, — "Russ" being the name given by the Finns to the Swedes, who were thus identified with the Varyágs as Scandinavians. The work of giving a certain national character to the Russian country and people was further continued by Rurik's successor and brother Oleg (879–913), who, with the aid of an army, attached to the Russian land the territories of all the southern Slavs, simultaneously

releasing them from their allegiance to the Khazárs. It was Oleg, moreover, who chose Kiev as his place of residence, and made it the capital of Russia.

The first effort of the Russian Slavs at nation-building was thus due to the Scandinavians. Under the influence of the Varyág administration, the tribes had begun to surrender the various distinctions which kept them apart. Not only had their local designations fallen gradually away, but every tribe, and every member of it, had finally learned to answer to the name of Russian. And though the Scandinavian influence had been unable to prevent the irruption of the barbarians, it had compacted and strengthened the defense against them, and it had gone far to serve notice upon the outside world that the Russians were a people. It is true that the internal dissensions did not immediately pass away, yet, as the struggles for supremacy between the princes implied a nation over which supremacy was to be established, the very disorder which followed the coming of the Varyágs could not have been without its educational influence upon popular conceptions. Certain it is that after the arrival of the Scandinavians we hear no more of the quarrels between commune and commune, between *volost* and *volost*, which made the old order unendurable. That the Varyág

princes put the Slav house in order and taught the Russians how to govern themselves — taught them, above all, important and much-needed lessons in city administration — is manifest. But for any deeper modification of Russian character and life we look in vain. The Varyágs did not "edit the language," as the Normans edited English; nor was there a court in Russia at which the Norse tongue was spoken exclusively. The addition of ten words, according to Soloviév, marks the extent of the impress which the Scandinavians made upon Russian speech. The northerners, nevertheless, brought with them certain useful juridical and social ideas; most important of all, a system of military organization which was to serve for administrative purposes in Russia until the course of development submerged it under the all-embracing domination of an autocratically governed state.

Nor were the Scandinavians the only foreigners whose work was felt in the founding of the Russian state. An influence still more profound was to be exerted upon this nucleus of a nation by the Greek priests and missionaries whose proselytizing inroads upon the primitive paganism of the people had begun soon after the foundation of Kiev. The first Christian monarch of Russia was Olga, the widow of Igor, himself the successor of Oleg; and though she failed to convert her son Svyato-

sláv (964–972), it was none the less reserved for her grandson Vladímir (980–1015) to become the champion of the new religion in Russia, and to be forever associated in the annals of the country with the historic ceremony by which, casting off their heathen faith, the Russians avowed themselves Christians. Vladímir's first care, after his own conversion, was to baptize his sons; his next was to order the destruction of the idols in the presence of the people, solemnly summoned to participate under penalty of being treated as the prince's personal enemies. The scene which followed, as described by Nestor, must have been unusually imposing. Gathered on the high cliffs of the Dniepr, the sectarians of the old beliefs — men, women, and children — were compelled to look down upon the humiliation of their divinities. It was the fortune of some of the idols to be hewn in pieces; others were burnt with fire. The worst fate of all overtook the great image of Perún, with its head of silver and beard of gold: first lashed like a culprit, it was thereupon hurled into the flood from the heights. Then, at the word of command, the assembled thousands descended into the river, and, by words of the priest and the force of Greek ritual, were made Christians.

The new faith was carried without much difficulty to the south; it was in passing to the north,

the northeast, and east, along the line of the Oká and the Volga, that the greatest degree of resistance was encountered. In Nóvgorod, so much force had to be used by the local authorities that, in the words of a legend, "Putyátin (the war leader) baptized with the sword, and Dobrynya (uncle of Vladímir) with fire." At Rostóv, bishops were driven out and missionaries massacred. The saints of the new faith triumphed in the end, yet they did so only by absorbing some of the attributes of the pagan divinities they could not wholly supplant. Thus, where Perún once thundered, it is the Christian Ilya (Elias), the deafening noise of whose chariot is heard as he drives through the heavens; so Vlas, representing St. Basilius, has succeeded to Volos in the task of guarding cattle; there has been a similar transfer of pagan attributes to St. Nicholas, St. George, St. Andrew, and to other personages of the church calendar.

Superior to all forms of paganism, not only in the largeness and simplicity of its conceptions, but also, as presented by the Byzantine priests, in the splendor of its ceremonials, the Christian religion dominated the will while it fascinated the imagination of Slav and Finn and Tatar alike. Yet its triumph over heathenism was the triumph not only of a higher form of religion, but also of the superior social views which it embodied. For be-

liefs and practices indifferent or injurious to social welfare, Christianity enjoined forms of conduct conducive to human progress. Above all, it refashioned ideas regarding the sex relations. Intensifying family affection by a process of concentration, it provided a new care for and interest in children, and thus brought into play a new altruism towards future generations. But it also did an important work in intervening between the slave and his master, between the ruler and his subjects. For when Christianity began to exert its influence as a national religion, the country was already in the grasp of a peculiar form of feudalism, which not only sanctioned slavery, but was the source of constant resort to civil war.

The prevailing form of government in the early period was known as the "*udyélny* system," taking its name from the word *udyél*, meaning "share." It may be described as a compromise between the Scandinavian practice of parceling out territories among members of the royal family, and the old Slav custom of common property in the family, with provision for the rule of the elder, but a compromise still further complicated by the right of primogeniture, or inheritance by the eldest son, imported from Byzantium. The central feature of the system — or rather custom, for it depended

wholly on compliance with usage — was the principle of possession and rule by the family of princes and their descendants. In the Slav view of the relations between the princes, the land, however it might be divided and distributed, belonged to the *gens*, — to all the members of the Rurik family, — and every prince was entitled to a "share" during his lifetime. This he could divide and transmit to his children in the male line. But the territories thus descending to the sons from the parent did not become their absolute property, since the absolute possession of the land rested in all the descendants of Rurik. Besides inheriting the princely dignity, each son received his share of the paternal estates, but received it only for the period of his natural life, or until such time as he migrated to another territory. That the princes could give up one "share" for another was provided by the system, and they did actually migrate from territory to territory. The occasion for changes of this kind was usually given by the succession of a new grand-prince to the throne of his predecessor at Kiev. For each son of a prince, by attaining to the princely dignity, also acquired eligibility for the position of supreme power in the Russian land. But actually to succeed to this power, to be a grand-prince of Russia, he had to be the eldest member at that time living in the

whole family of princes. Thus, when the grand-prince at Kiev came to die, it was not any of his sons, not even the eldest of them, who succeeded to the vacant throne, but the eldest Russian prince then living, in whatever part of the country he might happen to be ruling, — perhaps a brother, a father-in-law, an uncle, or a still more distant relative of the deceased. This eldest member of the Rurik family would at once vacate his principality in order to become grand-prince in Kiev; thereupon the next oldest prince passed to the principality thus vacated by the new grand-prince; another moved into his territory; and so the change went on by a process which usually resulted in a more or less complete "redistribution of seats" throughout Russia. As, moreover, the "shares" varied in the degree of their material or their political desirableness, or in both, each prince naturally tried to move into the "share" which should bring him nearest to Kiev. There was thus a constant procession of princes towards the richer and more desirable "shares," and therefore towards supreme power in the Russian land.

In the early days of the nation, when the princes were few, the working of the system was comparatively simple. But the increase in the number of the Rurik family soon made the satisfaction of the multifarious and conflicting demands thence

arising a most difficult, almost an insoluble problem. Jealousies arose both within and outside the individual family of the prince; there were not only quarrels over the grand-princedom, but also conflicts over individual "shares" among members of the same family. The Slav custom, as interpreted by Yaroslav (1019–54), besides giving the supremacy at Kiev to the eldest of the princes, provided also for the supremacy of the eldest son in each individual princely family. The refusal of the younger sons to recognize this supremacy, together with the tendency of the elder to use his position autocratically by withholding the *volosti* from his younger brothers, — these were frequent sources of conflict. The princes, again, were not always agreed as to who was the eldest among them, the one qualified for the position in Kiev. The sons of the grand-prince, resting their claim on the Byzantine law, frequently demanded and fought for principalities which, by the Slav custom of inheritance, belonged to the eldest of the Rurik family rather than to the eldest son of a prince. Then came, with ever increasing force, the sources of quarrel arising through the excessive multiplication of princely candidates for "shares," and from the divisions and redivisions which such multiplication brought about. That this constant and well-nigh endless parceling out of the terri-

tory did not indefinitely increase the number of the principalities is due to the fact that, while the land was being continually subdivided to make provision for new claimants, the territorial designations remained unchanged. It is therefore for this reason that, from the middle of the eleventh century to well-nigh the middle of the thirteenth, the chief divisions of Russia continued to be the principalities of Smolensk (including the Volga, Dniepr, and Duna); Kiev (with its dependent Pereyáslavl, and the appanages of Výshegorod, Byélgorod, and Torchesk); Chernígov (right bank of the Dniepr, with Stárodub and Lyubech); Nóvgorod-Syéversky (with Putíval, Kursk, and Briansk); Ryazán and Múrom (double principality); Súzdal; and Nóvgorod (with Pskov and Vyatka).

The *udyélny* system, despite its immediate local causes and characteristically Russian form, really represented that stage of transition through which all tribes, *peuplades*, and nations pass on their way to political unification. To some extent, this is brought out by the functions of its chief officers as well as by the relations which existed between them. The prince of early Russian history (*knyaz*, from a root word meaning "progenitor") is sometimes called *udyélny* prince, to distinguish him from the grand-prince enthroned at Kiev.

This ordinary or *udyélny* prince in Russia was supreme and independent in his own territory. He had his band of armed followers, known as the *druzhína*, built fortresses and cities, issued edicts, was chief lawgiver and judge, and could make war or peace. It was also the right of the prince, with the consent of the metropolitan, to appoint and dismiss the bishops, in case an eparchy existed in his "share." The grand-prince, on the other hand, had in addition rights and powers as supreme head of the federated principalities. He was their chief federal officer; upon him devolved the duty of making peace between the individual princes in time of conflict; he had under his care the general foreign relations of Russia, and was the leader and commander of its united forces in time of war. He had no power of interference with the government of the other principalities, and could not levy therein either taxes or tribute.

The authority of the princes thus rested upon military force, which they did not hesitate to use on occasion. But their prerogative was not an unlimited one. The people claimed rights of their own, and had been accustomed to assert them from an early period. The popular liberties were embodied, first, in the *véché*, or assembly, a sort of folkmote or people's parliament; and, next, in the "republic," a principality where the subjects

had so far gained the upper hand of their ruler as to be able, by the imposition of conditions, to make his actions conform to their own will. That this form of folkmote existed in all parts of Russia is beyond question; it is equally certain that when the people were not present *en masse*, they were always represented in it by heads of families, elders, or chiefs. The power wielded in this popular assembly may be described in the statement that it was accustomed to exercise, "on a larger or smaller scale, legislative, executive, judicial, and even political power." In practice the folkmote could pronounce for some particular member of the Rurik family, without absolute right to say who should be the grand-prince. That the popular assembly did usually intervene in political matters is sufficiently shown by the language in which the Tsar Iván III. informed the people of Nóvgorod, in 1478, of the conditions he desired for his work: "No folkmote; no elected magistrate; and the whole state in the hands of the Tsar."

In some parts of Russia, moreover, commerce had combined with the tenacious adherence of the people to their free institutions to set up not only a superior civilization, due to more or less close contact and intercourse with the countries of western Europe, but also democratic forms of government, by which the power of the prince and of his

armed band was greatly limited. From the tenth to the twelfth century inclusive, Russia was largely made up of federated republics, whose citizens, in the form of trade guilds, maintained commercial relations with the territories of the far east and north. The most important of these was the famous "Lord Nóvgorod the Great," — a republic with a metropolis of the same name, which had numerous tributary cities, its five *volosti* extending over the north as far as Siberia; its 100,000 inhabitants, and its subject populations to the number of some 300,000; above all, a democratic form of government, in which the prince reigned only by binding himself to respect the rights and privileges of the citizens as embodied in custom or as expressed in the popular assembly. Another of these republics was Pskov, with chief city of the same name, situated at the junction of the rivers Pskov and Velíkaya, and known in popular annals, after the fashion of Nóvgorod, as "Lord Pskov the Great." Here, too, there existed a body of citizens who did not hesitate, on occasion, to oppose their interests to the demands of the prince. Subject also to Nóvgorod, but far to the east, was its prosperous colony of Vyatka, the hardy residents of which had carried with them into the country of the Finns the democratic institutions of Nóvgorod. In all these republics the folkmote was summoned

by the ringing of a bell. Usually, also, the popular assembly chose and dismissed the prince at will, and gave the final word in war and peace.

It was to this warlike Russia of the earlier period, with its institution of slavery, its jurisprudence sanctioning private murder, and its *udyélny* system, giving to the ruler, where the popular element was weak, arbitrary power over his subjects, that Christianity brought some of the softening influence which it was so well adapted to exert as a religious system. The Byzantine ideas which came in with it were by no means always helpful; they cast the blight of asceticism upon the innocent amusements of the people, introduced cruel punishments into the criminal code, and authorized the chastisement of the debtor, or his sale into slavery. Yet, as a religion, the new faith exerted potentialities for good which cannot be ignored. Speaking with an authority higher than that of princes, it was heard not only in the voice of the archbishop stilling the rebellious tumult of the popular assembly, but also in the words of the priest intervening between the slave and his tyrant master; above all, in the command of the monk warning his ruler against the needless shedding of blood. Christianity helped to mitigate the rivalries and feuds of the princes, and thus to diminish those conflicts which were the

chief scourge of the *udyélny* system. Yet the priests of the new faith did their most effective work in the interests of peace by championing, in season and out of season, as against the system of federated principalities, the Byzantine conception of a centralized government under autocratic rule. And it was the progress of Russia towards this ideal of administration which was to characterize its life in the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, as the persistence of the *udyélny* arrangements had been the salient feature of that life throughout the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth.

III

HOW RUSSIA BECAME AN AUTOCRACY

When the twelfth century dawned upon Europe, the Russian Slavs had made unmistakable progress towards a unified national life. In numerous struggles with the Finnish, Tatar, and Tatar-Turkish tribes to the east, at whose expense they were continually enlarging the Russian boundaries, they had shown their ability and willingness to unite, when occasion demanded, in assertion of the nation's interests. Yet they were still far from being at peace among themselves. This is well shown by Pogódin's estimate that, in the 170 years subsequent to the death of Yaroslav, in 1054, Russia was the scene of eighty-three civil wars, and that the possession of the various principalities was contested in that period no fewer than 293 times. The chief source of disorder was, of course, the *udyélny* system, which provided no undisputed authority in the land that everybody was bound to acknowledge, and which had such little legal effect that every prince practically claimed the right to interpret it in his own way,

and as his own interests dictated. Yet there were sources of conflict other than the mere interpretation of the *udyélny* system; for it must be borne in mind that under the appearance of a single political type — the system of federated principalities, as the *udyélny* arrangements might be called — three sets of political ideas were struggling for the mastery: the Slavonic custom, which prevailed before the arrival of the Varyágs, of bestowing the highest dignity in the gift of the *gens*, or family, upon its eldest member; the Scandinavian system, brought over by the Norsemen, of dividing out the land to the successors of the prince; and the western theory, imported into Russia by way of Byzantium, which claimed the inheritance for the prince's eldest son. It was all these causes combined which make Russian history during the latter half of the eleventh century a dreary record of almost continuous fighting between the rival claimants, and suggest the thought that, had not some unifying process come in to terminate the disorder, it might have been the fate of the Russian Slavs to end their experiment in national independence, as did other Slav tribes, their race congeners, in permanent subjection to one or other of the west-European powers. Such a process did intervene; and it was a process similar to that which carried most of the western

peoples from the condition of separatism prevailing in feudalism to the unity that finally brought a centralized authority under the monarchical system. But it could not come as long as the traditions of the Rurik family remained dominant, and especially while power in Russia continually renewed itself in the old capital of Kiev, which was the centre of those traditions. A new beginning of the national life was needed, — a complete departure from the hereditary principles which had so long reigned in the minds of the people, — and this beginning could be made only at a distance from the soil consecrated to the *udyélny* system.

The change was of vital importance, for it was to carry the national life from a centre in which its traditions were rooted to a region with which the people had nothing in common. To the embellishment of the city of Kiev, after Oleg made it his capital in the year 883, all the subsequent princes had made contributions. Vladímir himself (980–1015), who here effected the conversion of the Russians to the Christian faith, did much to beautify the city. He built a church, dedicated to St. Basilius, on the spot where the image of Perún had once stood, ornamenting its interior with holy icons and other articles of value brought by him from Chersonesus. To his munificence was

also due the erection of the Desyatinnaya Church, to the support of which he consecrated a tenth part of his income. Yet it was only in the reign of his son and successor — to whom we owe the first code of Russian law, the Rússkaya Právda (Russian Right) — that Kiev reached the height of its splendor. Yarosláv the Great, as he came to be called (1019–54), did much to carry the fame of the capital not only through Russia, but also into foreign lands. It was under his instructions that Greek artists were called in to decorate its churches. He spent large sums of money in the improvement of the city, erected in it many beautiful buildings, and finally surrounded it with brick walls. It was to Kiev, thus embellished, with its great fairs held in twelve separate market places eight times a year, that merchants flocked from every part of Europe and Asia.

But Kiev was now to lose not only its beauty as a city, but also its prestige as the metropolis of Russia, and the sacrifice was to be made in the interest of an outwardly insignificant and only half-settled territory in the forest region of the northeast. For while the princes had been fighting, the pioneer had been at work; and in the colonies resulting from his activity there were coming to maturity certain political ideas which were to prove fatal to the old *udyélny* régime.

The appearance of this colonial life which was to react with such reforming force upon the mother land coincides in an interesting way with the rise of the *boyáry* class in Russia. Originally a warrior, — member of the prince's armed band, — the *boyárin* was often rewarded for his services by gifts of land; and as he gradually acquired territory, his significance for the social system, from being military, came finally to be agricultural in character. It was the wealthy *boyárin*, in fact, who, converted into a landowner, needed peasants to settle upon and cultivate his land. The conquering of new territory by Russian arms made it necessary to provide for its settlement. And so the *boyáry* promoted the colonizing movement by offering gifts of land and certain special privileges to all peasants who would migrate from the older Russia to the domains which had thus been acquired.

The rivalry which was to destroy Kiev and set up a new type of government in Russia came from Súzdal, a region situated in the densely wooded forest lands of the northeast, with chief cities bearing the names of Súzdal, Vladímir, Yaroslávl, and Rostóv. It was in this part of the country that, by intermarriages between the Russian immigrants and the native Finns, there was gradually being developed that new type of Slav to which

history was to give the name of "Great-Russian." The territory, by its distance alone, was eminently favorable to the new political ideas. The Russian peasants, moreover, who migrated to the Súzdal region, being from the country districts of the older Russia, not only knew little of the town folk-mote, but came with no fixed purpose of insisting overmuch on popular rights. Hence it was in the northeast that the grand-princes could develop without resistance the new political conceptions which had already struck root. The country had begun, in fact, to move from the old idea of possession by all the members of the Rurik family towards the thought of power concentrated in a single royal house which should rule continuously by direct inheritance. The grand-princes no longer complied unquestioningly with the custom of transmitting their dignity to the oldest member of the family of princes: they strove, as far as possible, to hand down territories, in each case, to the eldest son. And in thus working for the new ideas of government, they were powerfully aided not only by the church, which was interested, as we have seen, in reproducing for Russia the autocratic type of national administration peculiar to Byzantium, but also by the growing weakness of the popular assembly.

The rivalry between Súzdal in the northeast

and Kiev in the south came to a head in 1169, when the prince of Súzdal, Andréi Bogolyúbsky, son of Dolgorúky, formed a coalition of eleven princes for the express purpose of destroying the supremacy of "the mother of Russian cities." Marching against Kiev with a large army, Bogolyúbsky took it by assault and gave it over to pillage. The fall of Kiev takes its significance as a turning point in Russian history, not from the triumph of one territory over another, but from the victory of the rival principles of administration represented by Andréi Bogolyúbsky over the old policy of the *udyélny* arrangements. These principles, carried out by Bogolyúbsky at Vladímir, his official residence, were vigorously continued by his successors; and the territory of Súzdal succeeded in asserting its supremacy over the other principalities for some time after that ruler's death, in 1174. And though the older *udyélny* system survived the fall of Kiev for a while, the time was now fast approaching when the separate rulers in various parts of the country, yielding their powers to a single monarch, would gradually submit to the definite merging of their principalities in the unified territory of an empire. Long before the princes could foresee this result, an event occurred which, calamity though it was, did much to hasten the disintegration of the old

order. This event was the incursion of the Tatar-Mongols, a formidable body of Asiatics who had already, by their numerous conquests, spread universal alarm through Europe.

The Tatars first entered the territory which constitutes European Russia in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and inflicted crushing defeat on a Russian force at Kalka, on the Sea of Azov, in the year 1224. They came again in 1237, and, after spending over two years in ravaging the country, sacked Kiev in December, 1240, and thenceforward had the Russians at their mercy. Thus began the historical "yoke" which was to weigh upon the nation for over two centuries, — that is to say, for a period of 237 years, from the acceptance of the Tatar-Mongol overlordship in 1243 to the day when, in 1480, its exactions came finally to an end under Iván the Great. It was a subjection as humiliating as any recorded in history; and yet, having regard to the enormous numerical superiority of the invaders, to the fact that only the nobles and the citizen class bore arms, to the lack of defensive unity between the different political divisions of the country, and to the military weakness of Russia due to long-continued civil strife, the defeat can only be viewed as inevitable.

We may distinguish between two periods of the

"yoke." In the first of these, extending from 1243 to 1328, the whole of the Russian country was in the power of the Tatar-Mongols. In the second, only the eastern portions of Russia acknowledged the sway of the Asiatic conquerors. The worst features of the subjection came in the second half of the thirteenth and in the course of the fourteenth century. The princes of Lithuania were the first to free themselves from the tyranny of the invader, but they did so only by severing their territory from the rest of the Russian land. The Tatar khans originally had their seat at Sarai, on the Lower Volga, which became the capital of the Tatar empire known as the Kipchak, or the Golden Horde. For a time they acknowledged the overlordship of the chiefs of the Mongol nation in Asia, and were thus successively vassals of Chingis Khan, Oktai, Kuyuk, and Mangu. But when Khubulai succeeded Mangu, in 1260, the Golden Horde broke away from its allegiance and became an independent empire, thus remaining until its gradual dismemberment. During the period of subjection the khans migrated from Sarai to the Crimea, and it was the agent of the Krym Tatars whom Iván III., after having massacred his companions, sent home with the message that he would no longer obey them.

The Tatar-Mongol yoke was one of both politi-

cal and financial subjection. The khan at Sarai, whoever he might happen to be, exercised the right not only of naming the grand-prince, but also of giving the various principalities and "shares" to persons of his own choice. Though for the most part continuing the custom of preference for the eldest, he occasionally appointed Tatar-Mongols, or men chosen outside the family of Rurik, to positions previously held by princes. The khan was the self-constituted judge between the princes in their quarrels, though he sometimes exercised this function by deputy, and could punish a recalcitrant prince either by flogging, imprisonment, or death. The chief burden of the Tatar-Mongol yoke was its imposition of tribute. This fell, in the form of a capitation tax, upon the whole Russian country, and was payable either in money or in furs. In the early period of this foreign supremacy, the collection of the tax was farmed out to the merchants of Khiva and Bukhara. These agents, under the direction of a superior officer known as the *baskák*, took a census of the population, and collected a tribute from house to house. The incidence of the tax was the same for all classes; but while neglect to pay was punished with the immediate enslavement of the poor, the defaulting rich were for a time enabled to evade seizure by the payment of exorbitant rates of interest.

Many debtors were mercilessly beaten — treated to what came to be known as the *pravézh* — before being sold into slavery. The *baskáki* administered their office with such rigor that the people revolted in Súzdal (1262), in Kursk (1284), and in Kolómna (1318). The killing of one of these officials by the enraged populace at Tver, in 1327, led to the partial extermination of the inhabitants of that city. It was a great relief to Russia when, in the fourteenth century, the princes were ordered to collect the tribute themselves and pay it over to the khans at Sarai.

The degree to which the life of the nation was modified by the invaders has been variously estimated. A certain, probably slight amount of race mingling was inevitable. The chief influence which the Tatar-Mongols exerted upon the Russian system directly affected its administrative methods, and derivatively the political tendencies, the morals, and the language of its people. We are not dealing, it must be remembered, with a country which the Asiatic administrators turned aside from some other destiny into the path of administrative unity and autocratic rule. The Russian people had begun to travel along this path years before the Tatar-Mongol invasion, having been forced into it by the waste and disorder of the *udyélny* system. What the Orientals did was,

not to create the direction, but to accelerate the speed of travel in a direction the Russians had already set up for themselves, as well as to determine something of the nature of the results of the movement. And they did this by giving the country a common financial system, in which it was treated, not as a confederation of principalities, but as a nation; by habituating the grand-princes, made agents of the khans, to the employment of autocratic power in the suppression of all popular privileges and democratic rights hostile to that central authority which the Tatar-Mongols aided them to enforce; and, finally, by intensifying, through the arrest of all intellectual development, that separation of Russia from western Europe which was to cause the violent reaction associated with the name of Peter the Great.

For several decades after the arrival of the Tatar-Mongols the capital of the country continued to be at Vladímir; yet with the gradual change of the political system the need of a new metropolis became more and more manifest. And it was through the choice of the Prince Yury Dolgorúky that the rulers whose policy was to give imperial dignity to Russia came to be known as the "grand-princes of Muscovy." The name took its origin in a settlement on the winding Moskvá, a tributary of the Volga, whose green hills and fertile

valleys had caught the eye of that prince as early as the twelfth century. Attracted by the aspect of the territory, varied in contour and picturesque beyond any other part of the Russian plain, he resolved to fortify the place, and there lay the foundations of a city. The first settlement began on the wooded hill called the Borovítsky Kholm, and the first church there erected took the name of "Deliverer in the Forest." Around the houses which soon followed was carried a wooden rampart wall, provided with a ditch to increase the difficulty of access. Traders were attracted to the city; the common people from the country districts flocked to it, alike for the means of subsistence and of protection; and though it suffered from the attacks of the Mongols under Baty in 1273, Moscow grew slowly in size and importance. It is mentioned first in the chronicles under date of 1147, implying a foundation at least several years earlier. The national hero, Alexander Nevsky (1252–63), — so called for his victory over the Swedes on the Neva (1240), — gave the city with its suburbs to his youngest son Daniel, who assumed the title of "Prince of Moscow."

In its new metropolis the country made not only a new political, but also a new territorial beginning. The falling away of Galicia into western Europe, the absorption of Lithuania by

Poland, and the continued independence of Nóvgorod, had reduced the state now undergoing autocratic development to the principalities of Ryazán, with the *udyély* (shares) of Pronsk and Pereyáslavl-Ryazánsky; Súzdal, with the cities of Vladímir, Nízhny-Nóvgorod, Súzdal, Suzdalian Galich, Gorodets, and Kostroma; Tver, on the Upper Volga, with the cities of Zubtsov, Kashin, and Ryev; and Moscow. This diminution of territory, being historically in the nature of a concentration, operated in favor of the process which was transforming the political aspect of the country. It yielded the nucleus which the grand-princes, by a policy of intrigue, of which corruption and crime were to be the familiar and ever recurring incidents, were to expand, with the aid of the church, into the tsardom of Muscovy. And it gave the opportunity for that development of the new Russia of Moscow and of autocratic government out of the old Russia of Kiev and the *udyélny* system, which we shall find to be less the story of the personal history of the long line of grand-princes who connect Andréi Bogolyúbsky with Iván the Terrible than the narrative of a policy to the realization of which all of them made important contributions.

The founder of the Moscow principality, with Moscow as its chief city, was Daniel Alexándrovich (1294–1303). After him Russia was ruled over

by nine grand-princes of Muscovy prior to the assumption of the title of Tsar by the tenth, Iván the Terrible (1533–84). The whole of this period — about 300 years in extent — is characterized by the gradual development of the policy of political unification begun by Andréi Bogolyúbsky in the twelfth century. The rulers who succeeded him were all men who, working for the ends of personal rule and family inheritance, neglected no expedient of craft or cunning to strengthen their hold on the government. Taught in statesmanship by the Tatars, whose financial agents they became, and encouraged by the national church, the grand-princes of Moscow devoted themselves without scruple to the work of breaking up the free republics, of destroying the popular assemblies, and of gathering into their own hands the power which had been wielded under the old system by the *udyélny* princes. Relieved from time to time by heroic efforts to cast off the Tatar yoke, the Macchiavellian policy which had its centre first in Vladímir, later in Moscow, was pursued through three hundred years with every circumstance of fraud and violence which the ingenuity of the monarch or of his advisers could compass. Iván Vassílyevich, for example (1462–1505), did not hesitate to use the knut, the flesh-pincers, the bone-breaker, and the slow fire, in the campaign

against his enemies; in breaking the resistance of Nóvgorod, besides deporting whole families, with the confiscation of their property, he cut off the noses and ears of the prisoners who had dared to defend the privileges of the republic. But the despotism of the grand-princes reached its culmination only in the reign of Iván IV., the first autocrat of Russia, most appropriately termed Iván the Terrible. Here was a monarch whose early excesses of conduct, due partly to a morbid temperament, needed only the opportunities of absolute power to make of him a typical madman on the throne. His punishment of people whom he believed to be traitors — carried out with the aid of a bodyguard — has supplied to Russian history one of its most lurid pictures; for during the "terror" he maintained (1565–72) all conceivable and many inconceivable crimes were perpetrated. That Iván slaughtered 1505 of the residents of Nóvgorod for having "conspired to surrender the republic to the king of Poland," and thereafter massacred whole families, until 3500 persons had been exterminated, was a mere commonplace of the outbreak. The interest of the slaughter for Iván seemed to consist in the variety which he could introduce into it. Thus, the Archbishop of Nóvgorod was sewn up in the skins of wild beasts, and then thrown to the dogs. Fínikov was

drenched alternately with iced and with boiling water until he died. Chelyádin, dressed as a Tsar and made to sit on a throne, was there stabbed to death by his imperial master. Iván also presided at the burning of Vorotínsky, raking up the coals around the body of his victim. The Tsar himself committed several murders, and ended by slaying his own son.

The change which thus substituted an autocracy in Russia for a system of federated republics naturally worked havoc with the rights of the people, as well as with the institutions by which those rights had been represented. It was not only that the principalities were absorbed by the grand-prince, and finally by the Tsar at Moscow, and that the princes, coerced into submission or tendering it of their own free will, one by one surrendered their power to the central authority; even the free republics, in the weariness of humiliation and defeat, were in turn compelled to put on the chains of the autocratic régime. During the period extending from 1472 to 1489, Iván Vassílyevich, or the "Great," finally destroyed the independence of Perm, Nóvgorod, Tver, and Vyatka. The popular assemblies were meanwhile broken up, and their bells confiscated and removed.

It was a change, as we have seen, not wanting in resemblance to that which carried so many com-

munities of western Europe from the feudal to the monarchical system. By a process which supplied superior incentives to exertion in the ruler, at the same time that it diminished the cost to society involved by the rivalries, the antagonisms, even the civil wars of the old *udyélny* arrangements, the country in three centuries had gradually substituted for the Slav custom of possession by the *gens* those western conceptions which justified the ruler in treating his inheritance as personal, and in transmitting it to his oldest son. Instead of being a dignity which belonged of right to any prince of Rurik stock, so soon as he should become qualified by age, the supreme power over the Russian land had now come to be vested in a single family, to which, theoretically speaking, it henceforth belonged for all time. Whose this family should be had been determined, not by any choice of the people, but by the accident of circumstance. Once established at Vladímir, later at Moscow, its very existence excluded the remaining princes from any of the opportunities they enjoyed under the former régime.

The existence of a ruling family in Moscow was naturally inconsistent with the titles and powers of the princes. The former rulers of Russia went on for a time calling themselves princes and grand-princes. Yet the appellations were mere names,

unburdened with the semblance of the power conferred by the old system. By and by, moreover, the very names grew meaningless, as the princes became mere functionaries of the monarch at Moscow, or took their part in the new system as members of the Tsar's personal following. And as autocracy developed, the old company of the prince's fighting men was replaced by a regular army; the ancient *druzhína*, or armed band, became a court, while its individual warrior found himself metamorphosed into a courtier, or *dvoryanín*.

The most serious of all the changes wrought by the founding of the autocracy was that effected in the relation of the people, thus deprived of their popular assemblies, to the new ruler enthroned in Moscow. From being merely the holder, during his lifetime, of possessions which belonged to the whole family of princes, he had become the absolute owner of all those possessions. Meanwhile, the people, once his subjects, were now literally the slaves of a monarch who was invested with absolute power over their properties and their lives.

IV

PETER THE GREAT AND "EUROPEANIZATION"

Russia lived through her feudal period, and gathered strength for her autocratic system, in a state of almost complete isolation from the countries of western Europe. Severed from them not only by her geographical position, but also by the peculiarities of her speech, she had long been ignored by the science as well as by the diplomacy of the west. It had become the custom, in fact, to treat her as a sort of unexplored borderland situated on the confines of Tatary, or somewhere in the line of travel to the far Indies; useful enough for purposes of investigation as well as for the study of barbarous races and their outlandish varieties of speech, but altogether unsuited as a community to be admitted into political alliance or relationship with the more progressive nations and races. To this ignorance was added, moreover, a fear lest the Russians, with whose race characters the lively western imagination had been at work, should come to a position of power in the councils of Europe. And though efforts were made by

leading Europeans to prevent this westward extension of Russian influence, the results reached were insignificant. For it was the destiny of Russia not only to come into close contact with, but also to enter into much of the heritage of, the older civilizations; and nowhere was the story of this destiny so plainly written as upon the external aspect and inner life of the capital.

The Moscow of the sixteenth century, transformed and embellished by the art of a renascence which, though Russia had no creative part in it, dowered the city with some of its choicest gifts, emerges from the long night of the Tatar-Mongol domination with its face, in which traits from the Orient still linger, definitely set towards the west. Beginning as a *Kreml*, or "fortress," the metropolis had carried its busy life beyond successively reared encircling walls far into the adjacent country. For a time this extension had given its suburbs the aspect of an immense village, hemmed in by cloisters with their outer fringe of gardens and orchards. Then, as Moscow grew and its divisions took shape, separating it into the Kitai-górod, or "Chinese" city, the Byélgórod, or "White" city, and finally the Zemlyangórod, or "Earth-wall" city, the old capital of Russia began to present the general aspect which it still preserves. Radiating outward from the Fortress, the outlines

of important thoroughfares like the Varvárka, the Srétenka, and the Arbátskaya had already shown themselves; within the Kreml there had arisen not a few of the palaces and cathedrals which, even in the days of Iván the Terrible, redeemed Moscow, with its 41,500 wooden houses, from the reproach of utter Orientalism. High over the crenelated ramparts of the Fortress towered the cupolas of the Arkhangel Cathedral, sheltering the remains of Russia's grand-princes; of the Cathedral of the Annunciation, to which the Tsars came to be wedded; and the Cathedral of the Assumption, — built by the Italian architect Fioraventi, — in which, since the time of Iván the Terrible, Russia's rulers have always been crowned. On the Red Square already stood the Church of Vassily the Blessed, with its bewildering conceits of form and color; near by could be seen the Tower of Iván the Great, and the famous "King of Bells."

But the Moscow of the sixteenth century was something more than a mass of buildings touched here and there with a rude splendor that could be seen afar off, — with golden cupolas that flashed in the sun, or with bulblike church summits steeped in tints of the field and sky. It was the centre of those new currents of life which, setting in from western Europe, were not only to uproot the last remnants of the Tatar-Mongol inheritance, but

were gradually to refashion Russia into more or less of likeness with the older world from which she had so long been kept apart. The process of assimilation had begun, in the early years of the *udyélny* system, with the relations — of intermarriage, and also of court life — maintained by Yarosláv and his family with various west-European monarchs, as well as with the activity of the Nóvgorod traders, who carried the civilization of the west far over the Russian north. The nation had also benefited from the temporary absorption of some of her territories — notably Kiev and other cities of Little-Russia — by Poland and Lithuania in the fourteenth century, since on the return to her of these territories, by treaty or conquest, in the seventeenth, she gained all the advantage of their extended contact with the west. Another stimulus to Russian development was the immigration from Little-Russia of priests, teachers, statesmen, and theologians, who did much to reawaken the intellectual life which had been so effectually suspended by the Tatar-Mongols. Still more important was the part played by Poland, with its court alternately Italian and French, as a highway through which the new culture was being constantly carried eastward. Moscow, meanwhile, receiving from all sources the envoys of the western civilization, had distributed

their gifts far and wide. It was Moscow which opened its gates to the host of Italians and Greeks who flocked to the capital in the train of the Greek princess, Sophia Palæologus, on the occasion of her marriage to Iván the Great (1472). Moscow was to be again in direct contact with the west when Polish customs came in for a time with the False Dmitry and his wife Marina, as well as in 1680, when Feódor married the Pole, Agáfya Drushézkaya. It had long, moreover, been the policy of Russia's rulers to welcome, even from the doubting and distrustful west, all orders of professional men — doctors, engineers, artisans, military officers, etc. — who could be in any way useful in the building up of the new empire in the northeast.

It was such a Moscow, then, as this which, having founded the autocratic system, was now to spend a century in its consolidation, — was to devote the hundred years which separate the death of Iván the Terrible, in 1584, from the advent of Peter the Great, in 1689, to weighty tasks like the binding of the peasant to the glebe, the ousting of the Poles from Russian soil, and the suppression of brigandage and disorder in the west and southeast. Such a century would be noteworthy if only because of the fact that, opening just as the Rurik dynasty is about to pass away forever, it

ushers in the Románov family, the first member of which to become Tsar was Feódor Ivánovich (1584–98). He drew his title to the throne vacated by Iván the Terrible from the fact that he was a son of Anastásia Románov, the first wife of the dead ruler. Yet the situation was not without its uncertainties: first, because Feódor was a man of weak character; next, because Iván the Terrible had left a second son, Dmitry, from whom political complications were feared to such an extent that it was deemed prudent to send him and his mother Nagói — the dead autocrat's last wife — away from Moscow to Uglich. For a while Russia was governed, in the name of Feódor, by Boris Godunóv, who had been minister to Iván; and it was Godunóv who, having procured the assassination of Dmitry, succeeded to the throne on the death of Feódor in 1598. Two impostors, each pretending to be the dead Dmitry, successively disputed Godunóv's title to the throne. The first was killed; the second had the aid of the Poles, who succeeded in seating Vladislas, their representative, on the throne of Moscow. The peril of the nation was now great: it seemed as if a mere touch might overthrow the structure of Russian nationality which it had taken well-nigh 800 years to erect. And it was in this perilous moment that the monotonous, unpicturesque, care-

burdened life of the people blossomed forth into heroic deeds. Fired by the monks of the Troitsky Monastery, and by the personal appeal of a Nizhny-Nóvgorod meat merchant, Kuzma Minin Sukhorúky, Russia rose as one man to deliver its capital from the grasp of the invader. The march to Moscow had the character of a religious movement; bishops and monks accompanied the crusaders, and holy images of saints were borne at the heads of the columns. The victory was soon achieved, and then Mikháil Feódorovich Románov (1613–45), nephew of the first wife of Iván the Terrible — a fifteen-year-old lad, of thoughtful, studious habits — was made ruler of Russia. He reigned over the country conjointly with his father, Philaret Románov, the Patriarch, for a period of thirty-two years. It was during this reign that Russia entered into relations with the England of James I.

Mikháil was succeeded by his son, Alexéi Mikháilovich (1645–76), the second of the Románovs. The new monarch came to the throne not without some of the prejudices of his time, — a fact shown by the decree he issued (1649) ordering the destruction of all musical instruments. Yet the journey which he undertook abroad was to do much towards liberalizing the views of a ruler who had thus far seen only his

own country. It is certain that from the wars against Poland he returned with that knowledge of the west which was to make him in more than a chronological sense the predecessor of Peter. His union with Natáliya, niece and adopted daughter of his minister Matvéyev, who had married a Scotchwoman, brought him into a society whose free manners won him over more and more to the culture of the west. The Tsar soon shocked the Orthodox by taking up hunting as his favorite sport; his wife, meanwhile, caused no little astonishment by raising the curtain of her carriage in her progress through the streets. Finally, theatrical representations were given in the German quarter; and so delighted with them was the monarch that he caused a permanent theatre to be erected at Preobrazhénsky.

A single reign had thus sufficed to prepare the old order in Russia for the doom which awaited it; and when the uneventful régime of Feódor Alexéyevich (1676–82) had passed away, the gloomy Byzantinism of the Russian seventeenth century was already a lost cause. Yet the civilization of the *térem*[1] and the cloister did not succumb without a struggle. Alexéi Mikháilovich had been twice married: first to Maria Miloslávsky,

[1] The upper room to which the women of the house were usually confined.

by whom he had six daughters and two sons, Iván and Feódor; next to Natáliya Kirílovna Narýshkin, who had become the mother of his two daughters and one son, Peter. Age and numbers were on the side of the Miloslávskys, but the elder son, Iván, was an imbecile; in favor of the Narýshkins were the excellent physical and mental qualifications of Peter, as well as the law of Russia, which recognized Natáliya as the actual widow of the deceased monarch. The choice of the *boyáry* and of the patriarch Joseph Joachim fell upon Peter, and it was Peter who became Tsar elect under the tutelage of his mother. There now resulted a contest for the highest office in the empire between the sons of the two wives. In this struggle the interests of the Miloslávskys were championed by one of the daughters of Maria, Sophia Alexéyevna. By intriguing with the Streltsý, a sort of imperial bodyguard, she helped to bring on the change by which Iván was associated with Peter in the government, Sophia herself acting as regent. But when, later, she herself made a bid for the supreme power, the forces to which she appealed committed her to a monastery, and enthroned Peter Tsar of all the Russias, at the age of seventeen.

As a boy, Peter (1689–1725) had succeeded in acquiring Latin, Dutch, and German. His read-

ing was desultory, confined mainly to historical accounts of his father and of Iván the Terrible. But his active, curious, eager mind could not be restrained within national limits. He liked to hear of foreign countries, and was happiest when, in the society of one or other of the foreigners who came to Moscow, he could hear of the wonders of west-European civilization. His favorite resort was the German quarter, then a common rendezvous for Europeans who happened to be sojourning in the capital. The society which met there, made up of men and women from the west, reproduced for Peter the manners and customs of which he had heard so much: there he could study not only modern fashions of dress, furniture, living customs, and architecture, but also the freer life of the western women, who not only took part with men in social intercourse, but contributed by speech and song to the general entertainment, and when the time for music came joined unrestrainedly in the dance. How much of Peter's predilection for west-European customs was due to the bright eyes and sprightly ways of Anna Mons, the German jeweler's daughter, with whom he there fell in love, will perhaps never be known. But it is hardly doubtful that it was the German suburb which aroused in the mind of Peter the ambition to transform the dingy, secluded, and largely un-

joyous life of his own people into something of semblance with the happier conditions which prevailed in the west.

Meanwhile, a new stage of his development had opened. As a child, his eagerness for activity had spent itself in swords, drums, and guns. To this he added, as he grew, an uncontrollable passion for boating. Instructed in shipbuilding and navigation by Franz Timmerman and Brandt, he devoted much of his leisure to marine pastimes. Only two months after his marriage to Evdokía Lapukhiná, the daughter of a princely family, Peter started off to rejoin a boat which had been built for him on Lake Pleshcháyev. By this time, he had acquired a knowledge of the art of war in the sham fights at his country residence of Preobrazhénsky. Mock citadels were there attacked and defended, military manœuvres planned and executed; in October, 1691, Peter conducted in person a charge with naked swords, and got so excited as to fight in earnest. The experience thus gained was applied by him in actual war, on the occasion of his campaigns against Azov, which capitulated in 1696.

The Turks thus disposed of, Peter could next take up his long-cherished scheme of a journey to western Europe. In the spring of 1697 he journeyed with a considerable retinue to Zaandam, a

small city on the coast of Holland. Peter was then twenty-five years of age, still a youth, yet of robust build, tall in stature, with strongly outlined features, of a dark olive tint, which could assume a merry, a proud, or a severe, even wild expression at will. When in repose, his intelligent face combined with his stature to give him an air of what might be called distinction. But this impression was destroyed, in moments of nervous excitement, by certain convulsive movements of the body and countenance which he could not control, and which made him not only shy, but also awkward, in society. Yet he had traveled to Zaandam, not for social entertainment, but to obtain a technical knowledge of the art of shipbuilding. When first seen moving about the city, he was attired in ordinary workman's dress, with a red camisole, short vest, wide trousers, and a tarpaulin hat. Hoping to gain the needed skill by actual labor in the shipyards, he went to work every morning on the Lynst Rogge wharf, spent the day in wielding the tools of a shipbuilder, and at night retired to a rude lodging, which is still preserved. While in Holland, moreover, he made inquiries into almost every branch of human knowledge and acquirement; visiting museums, factories, hospitals, barracks, and observatories, with such questions as "What is it for?" "How

does it work?" perpetually on his tongue. Studying anatomy with Ruysch, and natural history with Lewenhoek, he applied himself to architecture under Simon Schynooet, to mechanism under Van der Heyden, and to fortification under Coehorn. One of the brothers Tessing gave him lessons in printing; in the atelier of Jeanne Koerten Block, where he posed for a portrait, he himself engraved a plate representing the triumph of the Christian religion over the faith of Mohammed. The Tsar was similarly active after his arrival in England, to which country he journeyed in order to complete his studies in shipbuilding. Settled in London, he spent most of his time at the shipbuilding yards in and about the metropolis, and could be seen going to his work every morning, with an axe over his shoulder and smoking a short Dutch pipe.

Recalled to Russia by the insurrection of the Streltsý, Peter at once began the punishments, cruel beyond description,[1] which resulted in the complete extermination of the disaffected troops; even after axe and rope had done their work, over one thousand being executed, the wives and children of the victims were banished from the capital, and the people forbidden to give them either work or food. The Tsar was now free to take up

[1] "Rebelles ob silentii pertinatiam trahuntur ad torturam, quæ inauditæ immanitatis fuit." (Latin Diary of Korb.)

the scheme, in which his predecessors had failed, of opening up connections with western Europe through the Baltic, the shores of which had thus far remained in the possession of the Swedes. A pretext for war was soon found, and though the Russians lost the battle of Narva, Peter was able to bring his otherwise successful campaign to a brilliant close by the victory of Poltáva, on which occasion Charles XII., who had invaded Russia, was driven into headlong flight over the frontier. With the defeat of this northern paladin, Russia sprang into a position of power and consideration among the nations. Sweden, which for years had presumed to dictate the art of war to the Slav peoples, had now found her master, and the whole north acknowledged the appearance in their midst of a military colossus where only a semi-Oriental people had before been recognized. Peter had secured the Baltic for Russia. He had done something more: he had crippled Poland and Sweden, the only powers threatening him from without; he had also rung the death knell of internal disorder, and had gained at home the prestige needed for his reforms.

For a time Peter's scheme for giving Russia an outlook upon western civilization had remained in abeyance. But after Poltáva he felt sure of his European capital, and could write to Apráxin

that, with the help of God, the first stone for its foundation had been put into position. The work now began in earnest. It involved the overcoming of tremendous natural difficulties. The whole country, at this point, besides being on the uninhabited confines of the empire, scarcely rose above the level of the adjacent Baltic. Any city pitched there, to say nothing of the difficulty of provisioning it, would be in constant danger of inundation. Lack of food, lack of building material, lack of labor, an utter disinclination on the part of both workmen and officials to exile themselves in the interest of an enterprise which was generally regarded as impossible of realization, — all these obstacles had to be conquered. Yet Peter did not hesitate. The refusals of nature he overcame by the sacrifice of thousands of lives, lost through privation and hardship in the prosecution of the task; the unwillingness of man he conquered by the power of fear, — by the menace of imprisonment, of exile, of the confiscation of property, or of all these combined. Gradually the new capital acquired form, and Peter watched its successive transformations from a hut which he had erected for the purpose on the right bank of the Neva.

In considering the success which Peter secured for his schemes, — to most of which the masses of the people were uncompromisingly op-

posed, — we must take into account the help he received from devoted friends and confidential subordinates. Among these were Patrick Gordon, a Scotchman, his chief counselor, who won fame in many of Peter's campaigns; the Swiss Francis Lefort, whose house in the German *slobodá* was the rendezvous for Peter and his associates; Feódor Alexéyevich Golovín, in charge of foreign affairs; the two Dolgorúkys, Prince Kurákin, Andréi Matvéyev, Prince Iván Trubetskóy, Peter Andréyevich Tolstóy Sheremétyev, Ménshikov, Golítsyn, Tatíshchev, Neplúyev, the brothers Bestúzhev-Ryúmin. Associated with Peter in his convivial hours we also find certain boon companions, in his friendship for who man element of buffoonery is visible: men like the Prince Feódor Romodánovsky, whom the Tsar appointed to the office of "Prince Cæsar," and addressed as "Min Her Kenich" (My Lord King); the *boyárin* Iván Buturlín, with the nickname of "Polish King;" and Zótov, familiarly known as "Prince Pope," a title conferred during a masquerade. Peter loved to act out the fiction that he was himself a servant: "for the sake of example" he would constantly abdicate his functions as Tsar in favor of Romodánovsky, and would humbly receive from "Min Her Kenich" the decorations and promotions he had earned by hard work

in various subordinate positions. In the fleet this monarch was vice-admiral, in the army bombardier. After victories over the Swedes in 1713, we find him announcing in a private letter that he has been raised to the grade of general. After Azov he was promoted to a captaincy in the army. His notes of the year 1705 tell of "366 rubles received for my work in the shipyards of Vorónezh;" a year later he puts down 156 rubles "earned at Kiev;" while in 1707 one of his items tells of pay received for "services at Grodno as colonel;" another entry mentions forty rubles "received for my services as captain." One day, while at Istie, in the government of Ryazán, he entered a forge, worked for a while with a hammer, and then drew the payment for his labor. As master carpenter he received 366 rubles annually.

Peter himself toiled in the foundations of the new capital, and it was here — in the city of "weariness, cold, and granite," [1] as Pushkin afterwards characterized it — that he hoped to create conditions favorable to his schemes of reform. From Moscow, and from the masses which it represented, little save resistance could be expected. The old capital had already been the scene of risings against foreigners, and the temper of its Orthodox inhabit-

[1] "*Skúka, khólod, i granít.*" *Sochinéniya*, p. 357. St. Petersburg, 1870.

ants was not seriously travestied in the testament left by the Patriarch Joachim, counseling the Tsar to expel all foreigners and heretics, and to prohibit their customs, habits, and dress. But in a city like St. Petersburg, attractive to foreigners, the customs of the West would dominate, and form a centre of the new culture, from which influences would go out to leaven the whole lump. And it was in "Piter," as the metropolis was familiarly called, that the monarch formed the relations with the young Livonian woman who was afterwards to become his wife. Catherine seems to have begun her strange experiences as a serf in domestic service. Taken prisoner by the Russians at the sack of Marienburg, she had been the mistress first of Sheremétyev, then of Ménshikov; and it was in Ménshikov's house that Peter made her acquaintance. The Tsar was drawn to her by traits which strongly differentiated her from the type of *térem* woman so well represented by his first wife: not by her mental accomplishments, — for she was wholly uneducated, — nor yet by her quick intelligence, but rather by her liveliness of disposition, by the ease and freedom of her movements, by the naturalness of her manners; above all, by the assiduity with which Catherine, who was a woman of supreme tact, accommodated herself to his nervous, irascible, and explosive tempera-

ment. She even accompanied him in his campaigns, and so won the admiration of Peter by her patriotic behavior in the struggle against the Turk that he publicly married her, and signalized the event by creating a new order in honor of his wife.

An integral part of Peter's reform projects was the emancipation of woman. He began his attack on the customs which had condemned her to social seclusion by prohibiting *accoucheuses* from killing infants born deformed or out of wedlock. Another decree, putting an end to the practice of marrying the girl victims of the patriarchal system against their will, gave young people betrothed to each other the right to withdraw from the engagement. Not less important were the measures by which Peter drew women from their domestic retirement and isolation into the general life of society. Beside insisting on women being present at social gatherings, he arranged special assemblies for their benefit. One of the reforms which gave the Tsar most satisfaction was the change of dress, by which he succeeded in abolishing what was not only an outward symbol of the old Russia which he wished to transform, but also a shackle on the industrial activities of the people. Peter's decree on the subject ordered the wearing of clothes cut in the French or Hungarian style. For a time

the poorer people were permitted to retain their dress, but after 1705 the new regulations were enforced without exception. The luxuriant Russian beard had also to give way to the reforming zeal of a monarch to whom all memorials of ancient Russia were odious. People who regarded the beard as sacred, — such as the sectarians, — were allowed to compound for the retention of the appendage by the annual payment of one hundred rubles; yet in return they were compelled to wear, like an order or decoration, the receipt for the money, given in the form of a medal, on one side of which was the inscription, "The beard is a useless embarrassment." Into the same limbo of banished things to which Peter had consigned the old Russian dress and the patriarchal beard of his subjects went the habit of falling on their knees in the street when the Tsar passed in his equipage. Peter also abolished the custom of prosternation, — the remnant of the ancient practice of paying homage by beating the head against the ground, signalizing its abolition by remarking: "Where is the difference between God and the Tsar, if the same honors are paid to both? The honor due to me consists in people crawling before me less, but in serving me and the state with the more zeal and fidelity." [1]

[1] Soloviév, vol. iii. pp. 1357, 1358.

It was also at this time (December 30, 1701) that the Tsar forbade the use of humiliating diminutives. But Peter made no effort to grapple with the evil of intemperance, then common enough not only in Russia, but also throughout Europe. In his correspondence the Tsar formally acknowledged *Iváshka* (drinking) and *Yerémka* (debauch) as his chief enemies, yet he did this in a way which showed that he deplored, not the moral evil, but the involved waste of time. Peter's attitude towards the drink question is best shown not only by his frequent bouts with boon companions, but also by the indignation, cumulative to the point of personal violence, with which he would resent any refusal to drink with him. Tobacco-smoking, which the narrow policy of the church had long held under the ban, was now encouraged by Peter, who made it a source of revenue by granting a monopoly for the sale of the weed to an English manufacturer.

Peter brought to an end the old classifications of rank which had caused so much quarreling amongst the nobility; ordaining that service alone should henceforth confer the title to nobility, he substituted for the old system fourteen degrees of rank, giving to each degree in any particular department of service its equivalent in all the rest. He also reformed the administration of Russia,

and did his best to suppress official corruption. A senate took the place of the old council of *boyáry*. The first division of the empire (decree of 1708) was into forty-three provinces, grouped into eight governments, each province being in charge of a military general, and each government under a governor. The number of governments was afterwards increased, first to eleven, then to twelve, the whole being placed under the jurisdiction of a senate sitting at St. Petersburg. In the cities the merchants were divided into three classes, the first two being constituted guilds, with special rights and privileges. The municipal organization, based on the German model, empowered the residents to elect burgmesters, and these to choose the mayor of the city; the burgmesters and mayor coming together to constitute the council. The Tsar himself appointed the chief magistrate. A capitation tax, in the form of an impost per head of the population, took the place of the former tax on "fires," or households. The destruction of the Streltsý received its logical development in the maintenance of a regular army of 210,000 men, uniformed after the military fashions of the west, the weight of its support being borne mainly by the peasants. The reformer completed the subjection of the church to the state by abolishing the patriarchate and founding

the Holy Synod. His breadth in religious matters led to the settlement of numerous dissenting churches, and gave to the chief thoroughfare of St. Petersburg its spiritual synonym, "Tolerance Prospékt." Meanwhile, Peter spared no effort in the interest of education. Expert teachers were brought in from foreign countries, and chosen men sent abroad for foreign study. In order to facilitate the translation and printing of useful works, the reformer utilized an improved alphabet, — the modernized form of Ecclesiastical Slavonic, — in which, with certain modifications, Russian books and newspapers are now printed. Besides establishing elementary schools in various parts of the empire, he encouraged studies in the medical sciences, in natural history, geography; founded the Academy of St. Petersburg, as well as the first Russian newspaper, the "Gazette de St. Pétersbourg;" and began the issue of a journal devoted to military affairs. The services of distinguished foreigners were utilized in the interest of the Russian culture movement; among these was the famous Leibnitz, to whom Peter paid 1000 reichsthaler a year, with the title of "State Councilor."

Peter began his reign at the age of seventeen. He undertook the Azov campaign when twenty-three years old. He was twenty-five

when he made his first voyage to Europe, and thirty-nine when compelled, after an unsuccessful campaign against them, to negotiate with the Turks in 1711. From 1713 to 1721, with the aid of his fleet of 200 vessels under command of Apráxin, Peter carried on those military operations against the Swedes which resulted in the surrender to Russia, by the Peace of Nystadt (1721), of Ingria, Livonia, Esthonia, and portions of Carelia and Finland. On the termination of the twenty-two years' war with Sweden, the Senate conferred upon Peter the titles of "Great," "Father of his Country," and "Emperor of all the Russias." The reformer's second voyage to western Europe was made in 1716, Catherine accompanying him as far as Holland.

Two years later, when Peter had reached the age of forty-six, he made the discovery that Alexéi, his son by his first wife, was plotting not only against the reforms, which his idle, frivolous character made it impossible for him to understand, but also against his father, and thus indirectly against the state itself. The young man had surrounded himself with disaffected nobles, priests, and monks, and was maturing his schemes in direct connivance with the repudiated wife Evdokía Lapukhiná. Peter took alarm at the situation, as he did at anything which seemed to

menace his plans for the future of Russia. Induced to return home from his place of exile in Italy, Alexéi revealed the chief facts of the conspiracy. The information given led to the discovery that one Glebov, who had been carrying on a cipher correspondence with Peter's first wife, had prepared an address to the people. Peter punished the mass of the conspirators with torture and death. Evdokía escaped with a flogging. Alexéi was twice subjected to torture, and then condemned for execution. Two days afterwards, when an effort was made to force new avowals from him, he died under the knut (1718). A few years later the Tsar became convinced of the infidelity of his wife, whom he had just before (1723) solemnly crowned as Empress at Moscow, on account of her services to the state. He caused the head of the chief offender, Kammer-Herr Mons, a man strikingly handsome, to be publicly struck off; he revenged himself upon his wife by exposing the head, immersed in spirits, for several days in her private apartment. Hence, while the official records ascribe Peter's death in 1725, at the age of fifty-three years, to natural causes, the popular tradition of Russia continues to suspect Catherine of having protected herself from the reformer's vindictive moods by administering poison to him in his illness.

V

THE WOMEN REFORMERS

THE destiny of Russia to be "Europeanized" — to have its civilization assimilated, that is to say, to the civilization of western Europe — was not seriously interfered with by the death of Peter; for although that event brought the empire for over half a century under the control of women, their influence was on the whole favorable to the continuance and expansion of the reforms. First came the wife of Peter, Catherine (1725–27), the chief yield of whose reign of two years was a treaty with Austria. She was succeeded for three years by a grandson of the reformer, who, wielding power under the title of Peter II. (1727–30), secured a commercial agreement with China, and joined Prussia in the matter of a common candidate for Poland on the death of Auguste II. After the death of Peter II., the nobility made an effort to secure a constitution, which, otherwise liberal enough, provided for the renunciation of the reforms of Peter the Great, and the return of the government to Moscow.

Among the candidates for the vacant throne were the two daughters of the reformer, — Elizabeth Petróvna and Anna Petróvna (whose son became Peter III.). Of Iván (Iván V.), a son of Alexéi Mikháilovich by his first wife, there survived two daughters: Anna Ivánovna, the Duchess of Kurland, and Catherine Ivánovna, Duchess of Mecklenburg. It was Anna Ivánovna (1730–40) upon whom now fell the choice of the "High Council" of the nobility, mainly representing the Dolgorúkys and the Golítsyns, and it was she who, consenting to become the successor of Peter II., was promptly made Empress. But on discovering that the new constitution imposed on her, instead of embodying the demands of the nation, as she had been led to believe, had its origin in a mere intrigue, the new ruler repudiated the instrument, and, retaining the power which the conspiracy had conferred upon her, set about punishing the conspirators, the chief of whom were removed with the wheel, the gallows, or by banishment.

Anna, who was Duchess of Kurland, and had spent her early married life at the court of Mitau, could now indulge her German predilections to the full. Relegating native Russians to subordinate positions in the state, she selected Germans as her courtiers, placing at their head one Birón, whose humble origin she sought to conceal by making

him Duke of Kurland and "Prince of the Holy Empire." That the real power of the administration was wielded, not by Anna, but by this favorite of hers, is more than suggested by the name which it received, "Birónovshchina," as well as by the open hostility which the people manifested towards a régime which, ignoring native merit in the interest of foreigners, gave an Ostermann the charge of its foreign affairs, and placed the army in the care of a Munich, a Lascy, a Gustav Birón, and a Bismarck. Yet Anna knew how to enforce the policies which she thus delegated to non-Russians. Reviving the political inquisition of Peter the Great in the form of a Secret Chancellery, she not only wreaked vengeance for political disaffection, but punished for slights and offenses against the Germans, and did this with a refinement of cruelty not exceeded in the reign of her imperial father.

As an Empress, Anna might be called imperious rather than imperial. With a brownish face, in which freckles were visible, relieved somewhat by eyes of an intense blackness, she could not well be called a beauty. Yet being unusually tall for a woman, largely built, and rather masculine in appearance, she made an imposing figure against the background of the court whose members she knew so well how to keep under proper control. Her early experiences, moreover, had given a certain

"distance," not to say moroseness, to the manners which she carried into the social gatherings of the time. Her official life as an Empress had the appearance, at least, of industrious zeal. Up every morning before eight o'clock, the hour of nine would find her transacting state business with her secretaries and ministers; at noon she dined with the Birón family. But she loved ease too much to make a good ruler. Dividing her leisure between outdoor exercises, the playing of billiards, and the giving of costly entertainments at a time when the peasants were being "bled to the last kopek," Anna worked unceasingly to make her court the most magnificent in Europe. The loss of 20,000 rubles at cards in the assemblies graced by her presence was an incident which disconcerted nobody. It was in these same assemblies that, at the ceremony of the Festival of Bacchus, instituted to commemorate every year the event of her accession, each guest, on bended knee before her Majesty, drank off in her honor a great bumper of Hungarian wine. Anna Iványovna, moreover, was the Empress who provided her courtiers with the diversion of the notorious "ice wedding," at which the venerable Prince Golítsyn was sent home with his young bride to a residence built of ice, wherein the nuptial bed itself was constructed of the same material.

The fact that for about two years after her accession Anna made her residence in Moscow does not fairly represent her attitude towards the reforms. The German influence was generally favorable to the work which Peter the Great had undertaken without being able to complete. Beside abolishing the system of entail, which had not turned out according to the reformer's designs, Anna founded, at St. Petersburg, an institution which provided education for 360 nobles; encouraged the immigration of foreigners and artisans; concluded a commercial treaty with Great Britain; and completed the canal, begun by Peter, from Ládoga to St. Petersburg. The only wars of Anna's reign were that with France, due to the question of succession in Poland (1733), precipitated by the death of Auguste II., and the struggle with the Turks (1736–39), peace with whom Anna, after losing 100,000 men, obtained through the mediation of France.

Anna Iványovna died suddenly in 1740, after signing a decree transferring the throne to the three-year-old son of Anna Leopóldovna, daughter of her sister, Catherine Iványovna. Anna Leopóldovna had married Prince Anton von Braunschweig, and her son, Iván Antónovich, now became Emperor as Iván VI., under the regency of Birón. But a *coup* planned by Munich promptly

transferred the regency to Anna Leopóldovna, and Birón was deported to Siberia. The weak régime which followed was an invitation to the attack which the unpopularity of the Germans would alone have rendered irresistible; and when, in the intrigues of the day, the choice came finally to be taken between the solid claims of a daughter of Peter the Great and the pretensions of the boyish Iván Antónovich and Anna Leopóldovna, the issue was a foregone conclusion. Elizabeth had the military on her side, and her personal appeal to the soldiers in their barracks in the early days of December, 1741, when every man took an oath that he would die for her, determined the succession for the next twenty-one years.

The solemn crowning of Elizabeth (1741–62) at Moscow, amid great popular rejoicings, seemed to put an end to the administrative confusion and uncertainty from which Russia had suffered so much. The rule of the foreigner was abolished. The people welcomed in the new Empress one closely allied to them in blood, language, customs, and faith. The choice of Elizabeth, moreover, had caused the reversion of power from the issue of Alexéi Mikháilovich through Iván V. to the branch descended from Alexéi through Peter the Great. It secured the triumph of the descendants of Natáliya Narýshkin, the second wife of Alexéi

Mikháilovich, over those of María Miloslávskaya, his first wife. No sooner, moreover, had Elizabeth thus definitely restored the traditions of her father than she took care to secure the perpetuation of power in her own branch by proclaiming as heir to the throne the son of her sister, Anna Petróvna, who had married the Duke Charles-Frederick of Holstein-Gottorp.

As a social figure, Elizabeth Petróvna was one of the most engaging of the Russian tsarítsas. Brought up in the suburbs of Moscow as a girl, in close contact with the people, with whose children she had often joined in the old Russian games, she carried the simplicity and naturalness of her manners into her later life at court. Her sympathetic disposition won her many friends. Her beauty was of the Russian type — the eyes large and blue, the mouth small and pretty, the features mobile and full of expression. She was tall of stature, sprightly in her movements, especially graceful in the dance. Elizabeth spoke French, German, and Italian, in addition to her native tongue. Fond of society, she was also assiduous in promoting the welfare of her people. She encouraged commerce, and carried through various improvements in the system of public worship. It was she who, restricting the employment of torture in criminal cases, did away altogether with capital punish-

ment. Against the religious intolerance of her reign, exemplified by incidents of which the expulsion of the Jews was one, must be set off the fact that Elizabeth liberated 55,000 debtors who had been thrown into prison, simultaneously reducing the amount of their indebtedness.

Yet this imperial beauty was a zealous persecutor; her panic fear of losing power led her to commit many acts of cruelty. She maintained a court of inquisition, and was occasionally present in its torture chambers as a spectator. It was she also, who, in order to punish a supposed political intrigue, caused the lovely Princess Lopukhiná to be publicly whipped, to have the tip of her tongue cut off, and then to be banished to Siberia. During the reign of this ruler the system of private denunciation, by persons hired to enter families for the purpose, was much extended. It is said that on Elizabeth's successor ascending the throne, he had to recall from exile some 17,000 persons who had become victims of that monarch's jealousy. It is known that Elizabeth was privately married to Count Alexéi Gregórovich Razumóvsky, and had by him several children, including a girl brought up under the name of the Princess Tarakánov.

The story of Elizabeth's external policy begins with the war against the aggressive Swedes, in the

defeat of whom her generals forced the treaty of Abo, by which Russia determined the succession of its ally, Adolphe-Frederick, administrator of the Duchy of Holstein, to the throne of Sweden, and at the same time acquired all meridional Finland as far as the river Kyumen. The importance of Russia as a factor in west-European politics was next shown in the question of the Austrian succession. The death of Charles VI. had given the signal for a general outbreak, involving various European powers, and ending in the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748). This was followed by the Seven Years' War (1756–63), in the course of which Frederick the Great, who had conquered Silesia, invaded Saxony, and had one of his corps defeated at Gross Jaegersdorff by the Russian general Apraxin. The campaign against Prussia was continued, with varying results, until 1761, when the Russians, having entered Berlin, overran and conquered Pomerania. The sudden death of Elizabeth (1762) saved Prussia from still greater disasters.

The daughter of Peter the Great was succeeded by the reformer's grandson, the son of Anna Petróvna and Charles-Frederick of Gottorp. He became Tsar of Russia at the age of thirty-four, with the title of Peter III. The first act of the new monarch, whose natural unfitness for the duties of government had been aggravated by a

life of idleness and by faults of education, was to break completely with the foreign policy of his predecessors. Being a passionate admirer of Frederick the Great, whose portrait he carried about with him in a finger-ring, he formed a defensive and offensive alliance with the ruler of Prussia, and returned to that power all the conquests which had been achieved by force of Russian arms. In some other directions he seems to have made a bid for popularity. He protected Russian commerce, abolished the Secret Chancellery and its torture chambers, put an end to the persecution of the sectarians, and recalled some of them from exile with gifts of land; amnestied peasants who, under the influence of false rumors, had risen against their masters; and pardoned a number of persons who had been banished in a previous reign, Munich and the Biróns included. But his frivolous, undignified life, spent in dissipation and drunkenness; his preoccupation with the affairs of his Holstein estates to the neglect of the interests of Russia, — all these things contributed to draw upon him the dislike of the people, and to make him especially unpopular with the military class, with whom he most came into contact. The situation was suggestive enough in a court where military conspiracy was fast becoming a settled tradition; it was rendered all the

more critical by the fact that Peter had a formidable rival in his own household.

The rival was his own wife, Sophia Augusta Frederica, of Anhalt-Zerbst, whom he had married in 1745. The mother of this German princess had destined her for the throne from early childhood. Her marriage had already proved a failure, since it maintained the association of a young woman of developed literary tastes, acknowledging Voltaire as her teacher, and already deep in the study of west-European literature, with an unfaithful husband who, when not intoxicated, spent his leisure in reading stories of highwaymen, or attending performances of marionettes. But it gave her the opportunities she needed for the maturing of her plans. She had first, in accordance with custom in such cases, signalized her union with Peter by undergoing conversion into the Orthodox faith under the name of Catherine; thenceforward she devoted herself to a scrupulous observance of her religious duties. Besides this, she did her utmost — by a winsomeness of disposition which was natural to her, as well as by engaging manners which she partly imposed upon herself as the rule of her conduct towards people of all classes — to ingratiate herself with the people, and especially to obliterate, as far as possible, the outward signs of her foreign birth.

In the meantime the relations between husband and wife had become greatly strained. Peter began publicly to declare that the son borne to him by Catherine was not his own, while Catherine, fearing to be relegated to a convent, placed herself unreservedly in the hands of conspirators who were plotting in her behalf. Among the most influential of these was the Princess Dashkóv, whose popularity with the military was unbounded; Gregory Orlóv, Catherine's lover; and various other members of the Orlóv family. The arrest of one of the conspirators served as a signal to the others that the time for action had come. Having received the oath of fidelity from three regiments of guards, Catherine marched to the Winter Palace at the head of a force of 20,000 men. The only people likely to complicate the transfer of power had been placed under arrest. Peter III., on being informed of what had happened, abdicated without a protest. He died four days later at Ropshcha, whither Catherine had sent him in charge of a detachment of soldiers. The Empress, in her "Memoirs," attributes his decease to natural causes; the confession of Alexéi Orlóv, made nine years afterwards, shows that Peter had been murdered.

As the political successor of Elizabeth Petróvna, Catherine II. (1762–96) made a good admin-

istrator, and successfully continued the policy of reform. The fifteen provinces she found existing were replaced by fifty governments, which underwent subdivision into districts. She introduced a system which separated administrative from judicial functions, and made definite the already existing class distinctions by establishing courts with special magistrates for the nobility, the citizen class, and the peasants. For the nobles she created a provincial organization, including an assembly, with a marshal as its chief functionary. City merchants were definitely divided into three guilds, according to the amount of capital possessed. So far as the peasants were concerned, Catherine's régime was one of reaction. The Empress was the first to introduce serfdom into Little-Russia. She prohibited serfs from making complaints against their masters, and authorized new forms of punishment for offending agriculturists in the shape of exile to Siberia and enlistment in the army. On the other hand, she enlarged the freedom of the sectarians, restored to the Tatars of the Volga rights of which they had been deprived in the reign of Elizabeth, and permitted the Jesuits, whom Peter the Great had expelled, to live in White Russia. Catherine did much for the science and practice of medicine, and when vaccination was introduced into Russia, offered herself first to the surgeon's knife.

The secularization of the property of the church, which included about 1,000,000 peasants, was completed in this reign. From 1766 to 1768 Catherine was at work on a new code of laws for Russia: to secure the discussion of its provisions, she called together a commission made up of 652 properly accredited representatives from all parts of the empire. The somewhat pompous "Instruction," which the Empress prepared for this commission, full of high-sounding maxims, gathered from Beccaria and Montesquieu, — to say nothing of the sentiment, "For the Happiness of All and the Good of Each," which each deputy found inscribed on the medal handed to him as his badge of office — seemed to promise a move at least in the direction of constitutional government for Russia. Yet the functions of the Commission, as interpreted by Catherine, proved to be little more than those of a great debating society, in which questions otherwise the most risky and forbidden were freely discussed. The Empress claimed to have been aided in her work of codification by the debates, yet no proposal or decision of the Commission was ever made a law of the realm.

Petite in her youth, sprightly in manner, with a blonde German complexion lighted up by intelligent gray eyes, Catherine grew stout with advancing years, yet she never lost the dignity of

her position: court circles knew her as the first woman in Russia; it is the testimony of foreign observers that she moved in them "every inch an Empress." Nor did she, amid social pleasures and intellectual distractions, spare any pains to show the nation that she had its welfare at heart. In her conversations and writings it is "the Russian people," "the fatherland," which are forever on her lips. It was in the interest of her subjects that she gave up the Protestant faith; it was also to promote their good that she asked the physician to bleed her of every drop of German blood there might be in her veins. "No Livonian ruler am I," she was in the habit of saying, "but Empress of all the Russias." She thus had patriotic reasons for applying herself zealously to the study of Russian, which she came to speak and write with considerable fluency. But she was also generally acquainted with languages and literatures, and had some literary pretensions of her own. For the *littérateurs* of France she had an especial predilection. She corresponded brilliantly with Voltaire and Diderot, with Zimmermann, Falconet, and Frederick the Great, as well as with Potemkin. Catherine was herself active as an authoress: she wrote comedies, poems, and a "History of Russia," contributing to the Princess Dashkóv's magazine, "Sobesyédnik," a column en-

titled "Things that Were and Were Not," with Derzhavin and Fon Vizin for her collaborators. The Empress also took up lingual studies, made original investigations in the Finnish, Votyak, and Cheremis languages, and believed (letter to Grimm) that she had discovered a Slavic origin for many west-European words for "river," "mountain," "plain," "valley," etc. She did much to promote historical work, especially studies in the native chronicles, her belief being that "no history provides better or greater men than ours."

Catherine wished to be known not only as a legislator, but also as a philanthropist and a humanitarian. In her diary occur such sentences as these: "I have the welfare of the country in view — God is my witness." "I should be happy if my ideas were to contribute anything to the fame and welfare of my country." "Freedom, thou soul of all things — without thee, everything is dead." "I want the laws obeyed, but I don't want to have any slaves." "If you have truth and reason as allies, you can give them to the people." Nor was the Empress a mere phrase-maker. She occasionally revised the sentences of judges, and reduced terms of imprisonment after satisfying herself that they were excessive. Her tolerance towards the sectarians not only protected them from ecclesiastical fanaticism, but secured to them

certain rights. Yet when her authority and power were in any way menaced, she forgot her literary favorites, and did not even remain true to her humanitarianism. She involved Franklin in her hostility to the revolting American colonists; her fear of the French revolution and its principles manifested itself in dislike of Necker and Lafayette. In the same spirit was her treatment of Russian reform, the moment it ventured, in extremely modest guise, to show itself at home. For when Radíshchev, writing on the correct principles of judicial administration, dwelt on the evils of serfdom and championed emancipation of the peasants, he was arrested, tried, and sentenced to death — for doing, that is to say, what had been done before, though never in such inopportune association with a French revolution. The Empress saved him from the gallows, but he traversed part of the road to Siberia on foot, as well as in chains, and remained at his place of exile till the reign of Paul.

It was probably not Catherine's ambition to make of Russia a great military nation, yet there was something in war which, besides satisfying her womanly love of power, contained the promise of substantial contributions to the glory of her administration. Above all, it afforded to men who were already her favorites, or who might become

such, the opportunities they needed for distinguishing themselves. Catherine waged two wars with Turkey, one with Sweden, and a third with Persia. She had in the meantime been embarrassed by the insurrection of 1773, led by Emelian Pugachév, an escaped convict, who — in common with a number of previous impostors, all of whom had been executed — pretended that he was Peter III. It was only after a year of anarchy in the southwest, constituting a repetition on a larger scale of the disturbances created by the False Dmitry and Sténko Rázyn, that the rising was suppressed. The Empress abolished the Cossack power in Little-Russia, and took measures for settling the unpopulated regions of the Volga, the Don, and the Dniepr. It was also in her reign that Russia participated, with Prussia and Austria, in the destruction of the liberties of the Poles, and in the partition among the powers named of the territory of Poland, the result of the three divisions (1773, 1793, 1795) — taken together with Catherine's annexation of Kurland, also carried out in 1795 — being to carry the boundaries of Russia westward for a distance of about 350 miles. Catherine died after reaching the age of sixty-seven, on November 17, 1796.

VI

REVOLT OF THE "DECEMBRISTS"

PAUL I., the son of Catherine, promptly succeeded his mother at the age of forty-three. He opened the new reign (1796–1801) with a declaration of his pacific intentions. His circular to the European courts, reminding them that his people had been at war since 1756, that they were exhausted by constant hostilities, and wished only for peace, seemed an early and an honest effort to promote Russian development without war. But Paul left himself a loop-hole of retreat in his accompanying declaration of hostility to France; and when the successes of the Republic in Malta and Egypt seemed to threaten Russian interests, this fanatical opponent of French policy at once made common cause with Turkey against the armies of the Directory (1798). The campaign which followed surrounded with a new glory the name and fame of the Russian general Suvórov, but it left thousands of slain Russians on the battle-fields of Italy and Switzerland, and proved substantially a failure. From hating everything French with

the hatred of a fanatic, Paul suddenly conceived a passionate admiration for Napoleon — a change of front which brought, first a *rapprochement* between the two countries, and finally an alliance with Napoleon, in pursuance of which Russia declared war upon Great Britain. But the parties had scarcely found time for preliminary acts of hostility — such as the seizure of ships in Russian ports, and retaliatory measures by the English government — before an event of a startling character put an end to the alliance.

Paul had never been popular. He had ascended the throne with the uncertainty of his parentage suggested for the masses of his subjects in the coarseness of his features. To an aspect of premature age he added ridiculous eccentricities of personal habit. Discarding the silk stockings and buckles commonly worn, he clung to the national style of boot with the trousers pushed inside; went about wearing an old uniform coat which reached to his heels; and never parted company with an enormous shabby cocked hat which, even on the coldest day, he carried under his arm. His wrinkled face — the head above it bald — wore a melancholy, almost painful expression. It may have been the sense of his awkwardness which made him nervous: he was impetuous by temperament and despotic in character. The belief of thou-

sands of his subjects that he was a madman found a further support in the antithesis between his plan, which aimed to restore the principle of absolute authority, and his actions, which contributed powerfully to destroy that principle. He alienated himself from the military classes by forcing the army into unwieldy foreign uniforms, and by imposing upon an unwilling soldiery the usages of the Prussian military bureaucracy. Senseless prohibitions caused him to be disliked by the officials of his realm; he offended the literary and cultured classes by the punishments he authorized for the use alike of words and of articles of dress which happened to be obnoxiously associated in his mind with the French Revolution; the people he repelled by resuscitating the ancient custom of servile genuflexion, and by compelling everybody, rain or shine, to kneel in the street at his approach. By arbitrary conduct, by violent fits of temper, — he had threatened his relatives, especially his son Alexander, — Paul finally made himself odious even to his immediate surroundings. There were thus at hand not only the elements of, but also the pretext for, a revolution. It needed only the aggravation of the situation caused by the closing days of the alliance with Napoleon to force the conspirators to action. The scheme of the plotters, led by Count Pahlen, was that of a forced

abdication ; but in the Tsar's bedchamber, with the military guard won over, it developed into a personal encounter in the course of which Paul was thrown down and strangled with an officer's belt (March 23, 1801).

To the coarse-featured Paul now succeeded his handsome son as Alexander I. (1801–25) — a tallish man of graceful carriage, with a high forehead, a Greek profile, blue eyes, and a firmly-set mouth. It was under his administration that the power of Russia became more and more involved in the development, on the one hand of the ambitious projects of Napoleon, on the other of the various combinations formed against the "man of destiny." After taking part in several of these coalitions, Alexander was led — partly by the defeats of Eylau and Friedland — to join the French Emperor against Great Britain in the Treaty of Tilsit (July 8, 1807), by which the Tsar, recognizing all Buonaparte's conquests and readjustments, was empowered to take Finland from the Swedes, Wallachia and Moldavia from the Sultan of Turkey. The provisions of this treaty received a further confirmation in the famous interview between the two sovereigns at Erfurt, from which Alexander emerged more deeply committed than ever to the support of Napoleon — pledged, for example, among other things, to police the continent of Europe while the

ally was working his will in Spain. But the reaction from Erfurt was characteristically Russian and sudden. Removed from the glamour of Napoleon's presence, Alexander had to acknowledge to himself once for all that with France under such a monarch no *modus vivendi* was possible. For this change of front there were political as well as personal reasons. Under the title of "Grand Duchy of Warsaw" Buonaparte had practically revived the Kingdom of Poland — had placed it under the King of Saxony, and having proclaimed the emancipation of the serfs, had provided the Duchy with a civil code, a parliament, and an army. It was Napoleon's aggrandizement of the "Grand Duchy," by the addition to it (Treaty of Vienna, October 14, 1809) of western Galicia, which proved one source of the rapidly growing misunderstanding between the two sovereigns. The actual rupture, precipitated by the French occupation of Oldenburg, gave Napoleon the opportunity, doubtless long matured, of invading Russia, and thus led to that fatal campaign of 1812, with its disastrous retreat from Moscow, which has pointed the moral of over-reaching ambition and unscrupulously-wielded power for all time. It should be added that the Russian campaign against Sweden had ended in the Peace of Fredrikshamn, by which Charles XIII. ceded Finland and Bothnia to Russia as far

as the Tornea. As a grand duchy the new possession was guaranteed its constitutional privileges (1809).

Alexander now called Europe to arms (1813). The new coalition against Napoleon, in which the Tsar was joined by England, Prussia, Austria, and Sweden, resulted in the occupation of Paris (March 13, 1814), in the dethronement of Napoleon, the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty, and the signing of the Treaty of Vienna, by which the Powers determined the condition of Europe — among other things partitioning Poland for the fourth time. The Grand Duchy of Warsaw thereupon took the name of Kingdom of Poland, and Alexander assumed the title of its king (April 30, 1815), though the duties of governor-general were discharged by his brother, the Grand Duke Constantine, who in 1823 married the Polish Princess Lowicz. In June of 1815, the cannon of Warsaw announced the renascence of Poland. Several months later (November 27), the Tsar granted Poland a constitution in accordance with the recommendations of the Congress of Vienna. To this same period belongs the manifesto, signed by several of the Powers, known as "The Treaty of the Holy Alliance," afterwards nicknamed "The Alliance of Kings against Peoples."

The internal policy of Alexander had for some time been one of great promise. Liberally educated under the care of Laharpe, the young Tsar set out with broad views of his duty, and honestly endeavored to imbue the institutions of the country with the humane spirit of the age. He abolished torture, put an end to the confiscation of property, restricted the application of corporal punishment, reduced taxation, reformed the criminal code, and founded schools and universities. The first definite measures resolved upon for the emancipation of the peasants were taken in this reign. Towards the sectarians, the Tsar adopted a policy of tolerance and conciliation. For educational purposes, the country was divided into six circles, with a curator for each — St. Petersburg, Moscow, Dorpat, Khárkov, Kazán, and Vilna. The work of preparing teachers for their functions was committed to pedagogical institutions in Moscow and St. Petersburg; that of providing clergy was intrusted to a system of ecclesiastical academies, seminaries, and schools. St. Petersburg, Kazán, and Khárkov were added to the list of cities possessing universities. Under the influence of Speransky, his prime minister, Alexander seemed for a time on the point of granting Russia a system of parliamentary representation, but the opposition of the privileged classes caused the scheme

to be given up and its promoter removed from office.

Such manifestations of liberalism as these did not long survive the Napoleonic wars. A variety of events had conspired to embitter Alexander; and after the successive revolutions of Madrid, Lisbon, Naples, and Turin — all occurring within a year — had forced the signatories of the Holy Alliance to action, Alexander joined Austria and Prussia at the Congress of Laybach (January, 1821) first in a declaration denouncing the "false doctrines and criminal associations which have called down upon rebellious peoples the sword of justice," and then in the scheme devised by Metternich for suppressing the revolutionary spirit throughout Europe. It was precisely, in fact, at this juncture that the Holy Alliance became a union of kings against peoples; and it was now that the same monarch who had been so solicitous that the French should have free institutions hastened to destroy the slender fabric of popular rights and free speech in his own land. A few more years of inglorious reaction preceded Alexander's death at Taganróg in December, 1825, and then the régime which had begun bright with the promise of manifold benefits for Russia closed with a threatening sky.

The intellectual ferment with which the reign

of Nicholas (1825–55) was now to open came as the natural result of centuries of extravagance and misrule. With the passing away of Peter the Great, the autocracy which he further consolidated by successful war had taken on, in the growing splendor of its new capital, a pomp and magnificence to remind one of antiquity. The city itself had abundantly realized the wishes of the reformer. Along its magnificent thoroughfares — one of them, the Nevsky Prospékt, rivaling the finest avenues of the West — lines of palaces, churches, shops, and habitations had arisen. St. Isaac's Church, the Admiralty Building, the Winter Palace, and many other features of modern St. Petersburg, were already visible. More important still, this metropolis of the high north, with its dark winters and luminous summer midnights, was now in close touch with the western world. From its granite quays Russian ships, laden with Russian products, were making their way from the mouths of the Neva into the Baltic, and thence to the various ports of Europe. The successors of Peter had done much to develop this intercourse. Yet under their administration the maintenance of a "Europeanized" Russia had become a costly undertaking. The economical régime of the Tsar carpenter, who had labored with his hands, and had surrendered most of his patrimony to the

state, was followed by an era of lavish wastefulness in state expenditure. Delivered from the traditions of the older Russia, the Románovs found the excitements and dissipations of the new civilization irresistible. For nearly a century after Peter, as we trace it through the masked balls of Anna Iványovna, the *opéras-bouffes* of Elizabeth, the literary dilettantism of Catherine the Great, the court life of Russia was one of ever increasing brilliance. Everything in art, science, and literature which could add to the prestige of an administration seems to have been utilized. The decoration given for merit blazed everywhere beside the laurel bestowed in mere favoritism; and when native genius failed to supply lustre enough for adornment, foreign firmaments were denuded of their luminaries. Successful generals were content to walk in the train of imperial power; poets were willing to devote to individual woman the adulation meant by the Muses for nature and for mankind. The Russian court had sobered down when it again became the turn of men to govern; yet the country was none the less irretrievably committed to the financial cares involved by its continual expansion, as well as to the external responsibilities in which Peter involved it when he made it a member of the European family. With every move of the Russian boundaries to eastward

and to westward, new recruits were added to the growing army of officials; with every further plunge into the complexities of European politics, the burden of militarism grew heavier and more exacting. Held entangled in the maelstrom of the Napoleonic wars for nearly a quarter of a century, Russia also had her struggles with Persia, her battles with France and England, and her continually recurring combats with Turkey — to say nothing of constant fighting which was the result of her increasing dominion in Central Asia.

The unified empire was an undoubted improvement on the divided federal arrangements of the Rurik family; the autocracy of the Tsars was better than the incessant civil war in which the country was held by the *udyélny* princes. But the amelioration thus secured was purchased at an enormous price, and its burden fell, not upon the high and mighty, in whose interest the state was magnified and embellished, but upon the humblest and yet withal the largest class in the empire — the peasantry. It is the contrast between the misery and degradation of this class, and the luxurious magnificence which it fed through centuries of serfdom, that makes the story of the common people — originally called the "ill-smelling," the "black" people; officially the "taxed classes," the "people bound to the glebe;" and

finally the "Christians," a word given by the Tatar Mongols — one of the most tragic chapters in Russian history. But the time was now at hand, when, through the moral influence of the cultured few who bear the banner of progress in Russia, the pomp and power at the apex of the social pyramid in Russia were no longer to be maintained by slavery at its base.

The conditions were thus ripening for a protest by this cultured few, though up to the end of the reign of Alexander I., the country had passively acquiesced in the autocratic form of government — in the state church and the institution of serfdom. Under conditions like those which prevail in Russia, any government may maintain itself provided the majority of the people either approve of, tolerate, or are not sufficiently desirous of change to take the risk and danger of opposition. And if no adverse influences are developed, such régime, even when it is autocratic, may go on for a period practically unlimited. The only hostile force — apart from foreign conquest — which can work against despotism in government is the power of culture, through its influence on the minds of the masses: should a people finally become enlightened enough to desire a more liberal régime, the administration is bound to give way, for the reason that the character of a government is always de-

termined by the practical consent of the governed, this being the case just as truly when the people choose as when they do not choose their rulers. The tragedy of the situation in Russia is that only a small minority of the people — the educated classes — have become enlightened enough to desire free institutions, and that their desire is overborne by the practical consent given to an autocratic régime by the masses of the people who, besides being ignorant and superstitious, are also politically unambitious.

The story of the development of this educated minority, which was to come into violent collision with the government on the accession of Alexander's successor, Nicholas I., is really the beginning of the story of the culture movement in Russia, and the study of it will help us to understand how it was that it became necessary to agitate again for the free institutions which the autocratic government at Moscow had swept away in the interest of national development. In reality, the early freedom of the Russians was that freedom of excessive individualism which all races seem to possess in the beginning — the freedom of weakness, of division, of inability to coöperate for common ends. The Russian people were originally so free, with their many princes, their democratic institutions, and their popular assemblies,

that they could neither guard against internal disorder nor coöperate sufficiently to protect themselves from the common enemy. The centralizing power at Moscow, bad as were many of its personal aspects, came in as a discipline which was to give to loosely cohering and often hostile territorial divisions the solidity of a nation. It made all the difference in those times of universal antagonism, with the blast of war beating upon them from the east and from the west, whether the Russians should be so much dry sand which the first wind would scatter over the desert, or the same sand compacted into a solid and enduring edifice. But when the discipline had done its work, and the empire had been consolidated, the opportunity came for a new freedom on a higher level such as would enable the people, without weakening themselves as a nation, to exercise some of those rights of participation in government which the masses possess in the constitutionally governed countries of the West. The champions of this freedom were the educated classes. The forces in their favor were the forces of the culture movement which had been gradually re-fashioning Russian civilization into likeness with the civilization of Europe. The hostile conceptions against which they had to struggle were embodied in the ideas, the conditions, and the institutions of the time, and were espe-

cially intrenched in the enormous power wielded by the government and the Church.

Now, if the reforms introduced by Peter the Great could have affected all the people in like degree, the practical support given by the nation to the despotic form of government would gradually have been withdrawn. But the peculiar conditions made this common advance of the educated minority and the ignorant masses impossible. The common people obtained from European culture simply the outer forms of our modern civilization, such as improvements in the conveniences and comforts of life, — at first improved architecture, better sanitary arrangements, then steam engines, railways, telegraphs, agricultural machinery, etc., — and thus remained as before, ignorant, superstitious, and politically apathetic. Upon the cultured classes, on the other hand, Peter's reforms exerted an enormous stimulus, arousing in susceptible minds not only the desire for individual perfection, but the ambition for such a degree of national progress, intellectual, political, and religious, as had never before been dreamt of. Hence it was that since the reformer's time these two classes had been growing farther and farther apart, — here, a small, highly cultured class, boundless in its aspirations, and eager to secure for Russia, in opportunities for the individual, as

well as institutions for the nation, every conceivable possibility of welfare, yet rendered politically powerless for good by mere lack of numbers; there, a class uncultured and unprogressive, severed from contact with the higher thought of the world, yet dowered, by virtue of overwhelming numbers alone, with the power to determine that all the people in Russia, cultured as well as ignorant, should live under an absolute, an autocratic system. That sooner or later revolt should come against the power of an uneducated and incompetent majority to subject a cultured and politically qualified minority to a despotic form of government was inevitable. And so, out of the tragedy of the situation, with its deeply-lying antagonisms of interest, there was gradually matured what has come to be known as the Russian revolutionary movement.

Already, in the time of Alexander, the protest had been prepared. Reading had thoroughly familiarized the cultured class with the political conditions of western Europe. By travel, especially, numerous army officers had gained glimpses of the happier conditions prevailing in countries constitutionally governed. And when the Napoleonic campaigns were over, — when, after being marched from the monotonous plains of eastern Europe into the verdure-clad heights and valleys

of Switzerland, Italy, and France, the armies of Russia finally returned home, they could not fail to display the mental quickening they had themselves undergone, or to carry to their fellow-countrymen the impulse of the new ideas, the fresh hopes, and daring aspirations awakened in their own minds by the brilliant civilization of the West.

The secret societies now began to move. The scheme of such organizations as the Society of Virtue, the Society of the North, the Society of the South, and the Society of the United Slavs, was the introduction into Russia of a federative type of constitutional government which should unite in a single republic the various Slav countries, Poland included. Serfdom was to be abolished, and various reforms, judicial, industrial, and social, carried into effect. The unexpected death of Alexander I. made his assassination unnecessary. The conspirators utilized in favor of their plot a peculiar uncertainty regarding the succession. The Grand Duke Constantine, eldest son of the dead monarch, after marrying the Princess Lowicz, a Pole, had renounced the throne in favor of his younger brother Nicholas. Pestel, pretending that Nicholas was a usurper, had no difficulty in persuading the soldiers to revolt. The rising, which took place on the morning of December

26, spent its force in the Square of the Senate. A few discharges of grapeshot sufficed to scatter the insurgents. About five hundred were taken prisoners; the rest surrendered. It was in the quelling of this outbreak of the "Decembrists," as they were called, as well as of a less serious one in the south of Russia, that Nicholas — who had himself directed the gunners — gave to the revolutionary movement its first martyrs, — Pestel, Ryléyev, Bestúzhev-Ryúmin, Muravyév-Apóstol, and Kakhóvsky, all of whom were executed, one of them so clumsily and cruelly as to provoke the comment from the victim that in Russia they did not even know how to hang a man.

Nicholas afterwards declared that if he had only an hour to live, he was determined to be Emperor of Russia for that hour. It was in this temper that a monarch, fitted by appearance as well as by character for autocratic rule, had quelled the effort to revolutionize Russia. Robust in physique, much over the ordinary stature, inured to fatigue, and alert in all his movements, Nicholas I. had the hard, stern features of a man who felt in himself the "divine right" of kings, and was resolved to assert that right. And it was with the prestige of his victory over the forces of disaffection that, having disposed of the revolutionists, though not of the revolutionary movement, he proceeded to

take up the cares of government. The preparation and issue of a new criminal code; the creation of a new citizen class enjoying various privileges and exemptions; the partial restoration of the custom of entail; the abolition of the *pravézh* (custom of flogging for debt) in the territory of the Don Cossacks, and the construction of the railway from Moscow to St. Petersburg, — the order for which the monarch is said to have given by drawing a straight line between the two cities on a map, — these were the measures which formed the most considerable achievements of his home policy. During his reign of thirty years, Russia was several times at war, — once with Persia and twice with Turkey. The result of the first struggle with the Porte was to compel Turkey to recognize the independence of Greece, to cede territory to Russia in both Europe and Asia, to open the Bosphorus and Dardanelles to general commerce, and to grant to Russia complete freedom of navigation in the Black Sea. The interval between the first and second conflict with Turkey brought the Polish insurrection of 1830–31. The standard of revolt was raised on the evening of November 29, 1830, by two young officers, Wysocki and Zaliwski. Led successively by Chlopicki, Radziwil, Skrzynecki, Dembinski, Malachovski, Krukowiecki, and Niemoievski, the Poles, forsaken by

Europe, fought heroically but unavailingly. The single victories they won could not disguise the fact that they were outnumbered; and when Paskiévich poured across the frontier with reinforcements, two days' bombardment of Warsaw sufficed to crush the patriots (Sept. 6–7, 1831). Then began the reprisals. The conspirators who possessed anything had their property confiscated. The poorer insurrectionists were committed to prison, or banished. Worse still, the constitution granted to Poland by Alexander I. disappeared, and was never again heard of. Five Russian governments took the place of the old Polish palatinates. Simultaneously, the religious union in the southwest, comprising Lithuania and White Russia, was abolished, and the Uniat clergy received into the Orthodox Russo-Greek Church.

Nicholas was won over, by instinct as well as by experience, to the policy of the "alliance of kings against peoples;" and when, in 1849, Austria gave him the opportunity to declare himself anew, he did not hesitate to send his legions against the little band of patriotic Hungarians gathered around Kossuth, who were struggling for Magyar liberty. This intervention in behalf of Austrian despotism, paid for by the Russian people with a deficit of 30,000,000 rubles, was the beginning of the end so far as the military prestige of Nicholas was

concerned. A few years later the "iron emperor" was compelled to expiate his assaults upon liberal thought and popular freedom in the disaster of the Crimean war. The reaction which followed — its force, its spontaneity, and its utter disregard of consequences — contains a promise for the future of Russia whose significance cannot easily be overestimated. For the universal dissatisfaction at once broke forth in a movement the like of which, before or since, has never been known in Russia. The corrupt administration of years was now called up for judgment; pen and tongue, breaking through the prohibitions of the press laws, joined in wholesale denunciation of Nicholas and his ministers. The strong-willed, obstinate monarch died in the midst of the outburst (March 2, 1855), and left his son, Alexander II., not only to make peace with the allies, but to initiate that policy of reform in Russia which could no longer be denied even by an autocratic régime.

VII

EMANCIPATION OF THE PEASANTS

THE new Emperor was thirty-seven years old when, with a sense of grave responsibility, he took up the burden of the earlier defeats in the Crimea. To the cares of his position he brought the thoughtful habits acquired during a careful course of training, as well as a plan of action not wholly uninspired by the humanitarian ideas of his time. Slender in physique and somewhat above middle height, he also had features which might fairly be called handsome. Russia looked to the new monarch for prompt action; and Alexander II. (1855–81) began a reign of which the first half was to be liberal and the second reactionary, with an effort to stem the tide of disaster in the south. But Sebastópol, thundered at with 874 cannon, had already fallen (Sept. 8, 1855), and nothing remained but to make the most favorable terms that could be secured. At the Congress of Paris, opened in Feb., 1856, a treaty was signed by which, in addition to other concessions, Russia lost her former domination of

the Black Sea (neutralized) and gave up her protectorate over the Christian principalities of the Danube. Her foreign policies, now committed to Prince Gortschakoff, continued for many years to reflect the caution produced by the disaster in the Crimea. Pledged to hold herself in reserve — to *se recueillir* — Russia seemed now to avoid foreign interventions as much as she had formerly coveted them. Yet when the opportunity came for retrieving the situation created by the Treaty of Paris, she acted with promptness and spirit. Thus, in 1871, at the Conference of London, she succeeded in her effort to cancel that clause of the Paris Treaty by which the Black Sea had been neutralized. In September, 1876, Russia entered with Germany into the Alliance of the Three Emperors. Intervening the following year on behalf of the maltreated populations under Turkish rule on the Danube, the Tsar declared war upon the Sultan, and after a victorious campaign in both Europe and Asia imposed upon Turkey the Treaty of San Stefano (March 3, 1878), by which Servia and Roumania were made independent and the rest of the Turkish territories of the Danube brought under Russian influence. The European powers then intervened, and the Treaty of San Stefano was profoundly modified by the Treaty of Berlin (July 13, 1878).

It was while these events were readjusting the relation of Russia to foreign countries that policies of the utmost importance to the national civilization were being worked out at home. Of these perhaps the most significant was the liberation of the agriculturists of Russia from their forced connection with the land they cultivated. The defeat in the Crimea had proved a blessing in disguise. It carried into the reign of Alexander II. the agitation previously begun for the emancipation of the serfs, and brought on other changes of vital importance for the welfare of the people. Human slavery in Russia was instituted about the middle of the seventeenth century as a means — at a time when the state, as well as the landlords, had begun to suffer seriously from the migratory habits of the peasants — of securing to the land the forces necessary to its cultivation. The legal enactment which definitely fixed the peasant to the soil was the decree of 1648 (reign of Alexéi Mikháilovich). Serfdom, confirmed and reaffirmed by subsequent decrees, thereafter took its place in the social fabric as a legalized institution. Not only did the serfs grow in number: they came to form the chief source of income, as well of the landowning class, properly so called, as of the Russian monasteries, one of which — the famous Tróitsky — had been the first of the slave proprietors

to benefit by the prohibitive legislation. In time, moreover, serfdom was extended to regions in which it had never existed. Under Catherine the Great, for example, the institution was not only reintroduced into Little-Russia, where Bogdán Khmelnítsky had abolished it, but was carried into the Ukraine, now the government of Khárkov (1788). A few years later the right of free removal was taken from the Don Cossacks, as well as from the peasants of the southern governments known as New Russia. The multiplication of serfs was also aided in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by the custom in which the monarchs of Russia made to their ministers and favorites gifts of crown lands, the peasants on which, though practically free, became common serfs through the transfer. In the reign of Catherine II. the slave population of Russia was thus increased by 800,000, and in the reign of Paul I. by 600,000.

For a time serfdom served its purpose; then the evils of the institution developed with rapidity. The class which the government had degraded into a mere machine for the raising of taxes soon showed that it could be a menace as well as a help to the state. How many dissatisfied peasants took part in the insurrections led by Sténko Rázyn and Pugachév in the seventeenth and eighteenth

centuries will never be known. Of the economic disadvantages of the system, it is enough to say that the profits of keeping serfs grew less and less, and that when the closing days of the institution were reached, it was found that two thirds of the serfs held as property had been mortgaged by their proprietors to the credit establishments of the state. But the most powerful objection of all was made to serfdom as a moral evil. The assertion of the doctrine that "man may hold property in man," so vigorously challenged by Brougham in England, had led in Russia to numberless abuses. A slave, if unruly, could be sent by his owner to Siberia for life. If he dared to make complaints, he could be knuted and deported to the mines. Sometimes charges were brought against peasants merely for the purpose of separating them from their wives. In the worst period of serfdom the agriculturist was compelled to do forced work on the lands of the proprietor, as well as to submit to numerous other exactions.

That serfdom was an evil had been early recognized in Russia, and the recognition came even before the institution had been denounced in no unmeasured terms by the Encyclopedists of France. Yet the Russian writers who ventured to attack it fared badly even in the days of such a humanitarian as Catherine the Great. The first formal

proposal for its abolition came from the *littérateur* Alexander Nikoláyevich Radíshchev in the form of a volume entitled "A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow," published in 1790. Eagerly read for a while by the educated classes, the book was thereupon suppressed by the authorities, the Empress herself being the severest of its critics. As for Radíshchev, he was summoned before the Senate and condemned to death, — a fate which he escaped, as we have seen, only through Catherine (who had perused his book in the deepest indignation) taking it into her head to commute the sentence to deportation to the mines for life, with the loss of all civil rights.[1] After Radíshchev, the subject slumbered for a while. But it was again heard of in the reign of Paul, who issued a decree ordaining that the peasants should not be compelled to work for their masters more than three days in every week. Alexander I. struck a blow at the abuses of deportation by ordaining (1822) that every married woman whose husband was condemned to exile should have the privilege of accompanying him into banishment with all her children.

[1] Radíshchev was amnestied by the Emperor Paul and finally called to St. Petersburg in 1801, to take part in the work of a legislative commission as one of its members. He committed suicide in 1802, under the mistaken impression that he was to be returned to Siberia.

Yet as the mass of the peasants remained in ignorance of the law, it became necessary in the following reign to pass legislation (1834) ordering the judge to ask the wife of every man condemned to deportation if she wished to take advantage of the law, with the result that in the great majority of cases the women elected to share in the exile of their husbands.

Meanwhile, the sentiment in favor of emancipating the peasants had matured into a definite policy. Alexander I. showed his personal attitude towards the reform, not only by renouncing his right to make gifts of crown lands containing serfs, but also by establishing a fund for the purchase of slave estates with a view to the emancipation of their slaves, as well as by issuing decrees legalizing contracts of manumission agreed to between serfs and their masters. It was in the reign of this monarch, moreover, that the first practical experiment with emancipation was made by a scheme, which the Emperor sanctioned, for liberating, in a period of fourteen years, the Lett and Chud serf peasants of the three Baltic provinces of Esthonia, Kurland, and Livonia. That the educated classes were profoundly interested in the cause of emancipation is sufficiently shown by the fact that the Decembrists, Russia's first revolutionary party, inscribed this reform on their

programme as one of its leading features. Nicholas himself strongly favored the reform, and used to say in conversation, "I do not understand how a man can become a thing. I cannot explain it save by attributing it to cunning on the one side and ignorance on the other." In 1847 the famous critic Belínsky was able to send word to a friend that Nicholas had definitely decided to take measures for the abolition of serfdom. But this monarch, after placing the matter in the hands of a committee, died before his wishes could be realized.

By this time powerful, though indirect, advocacy in the Russian press was having its effect upon the nation. Most effective, as an influence hostile to serfdom, were the writings of Gógol, the novelist, who familiarized his countrymen with its abuses in his sketches of country life. His famous "Dead Souls" (1842), revealing how wantonly human slaves with white faces could be bought and trafficked in like chattels, created a sensation. But the severest criticism of serfdom as an institution came in Tourguéneff's "Annals of a Sportsman," produced by one who, by the force of his artistic power and deep human sympathies — without passion, argument, or polemic — roused Russia as with a shock to the moral degradation of slavery. The irritated government, which

might have borne the "Annals" as a literary production, found its effect upon the nation intolerable; and so, when Tourguéneff proceeded to disclose a still larger part of his mind in a letter on the death of Gógol (published in the "Moskóvskiya Vyédomosti," 1852), it ordered the famous author into a month's arrest, after which he was interned for two years in the village of Spásskoe. Among the publicists whose writings helped to create a public opinion against serfdom, the best known was perhaps Chernishevsky, who contributed articles on economics and other subjects to the "Sovremennik."

The fateful year 1855 was now reached: it was in this year that Nicholas was summoned to vacate the throne to which, nearly thirty years before, he had fought his way with grapeshot through the ranks of the revolting Decembrists; that news came of the crushing defeat inflicted upon Russian arms by the allies in the Crimean Peninsula; and that, stung by the sense of national humiliation, the nation broke through all bounds, and for once, as never before in Russia, exercised the right of free speech on behalf of reform. Nor was it only that the new government had to reckon with the demands which were being freely formulated at home. From the free Russian printing office founded in London in 1854, the exiled *littérateur* Herzen, thundering for years against the adminis-

trative abuses of his native land, probably did more than any other publicist then living to force on the issue of emancipation.

It has been held that, by the action of slave-owners themselves, who were continually manumitting their serfs; by the operation of the law which made every soldier a free man; and by the effect of arrangements through which the foreclosure of mortgages by the state converted ordinary serfs into free crown peasants — serfdom would have finally passed away of itself as an institution. But the rulers of Russia wisely preferred to bring it to an end by legislation; and the honor of doing this belongs to Alexander II., and to such statesmen and publicists as Yury Samárin, N. A. Milyútin, Prince V. A. Cherkássky, Professor Kavélin, and others who were his zealous and talented assistants in the work. After much preparatory labor in committees, emancipation was finally accomplished by the Act of March 3, 1861. It was this act which enabled the peasant, while remaining a member of the self-governing body known as the *mir*, or commune, to acquire by purchase the land which, up till then, he had cultivated only as a serf. In order to facilitate the purchase of the land, which could be made either by the whole commune or by the individual householders, the government made advances to the

peasants (of amounts equal to four fifths of the capitalized purchase price) to enable them to acquire the land they occupied, under an arrangement which permitted them, by means of three years' rent paid down, and then by a six per cent payment covering interest, to extinguish their debt in forty-nine years. On these terms being accepted, the relations of the peasants with their landlords ceased, and the payments due were henceforward made to the government. The administration also aided the landlords, who received government scrip on which interest, along with the redemption money, was payable. It was at first only optional for owners and peasants to avail themselves of the redemption arrangements, but in the reign of Alexander III. (1883) it became necessary to make land redemption compulsory. Under the Emancipation Act, 21,625,609 peasants, or about one half the total number in the empire, were in this way set free. The crown peasants, already practically free, and therefore not affected by the act, numbered over 22,000,000; and to these must be added 2,000,000 appanage peasants on estates reserved for the endowment of the imperial family. In 1866 the peasants on the crown lands were also permitted by decree to redeem the land they cultivated under the conditions just described. The domestic serfs, numbering

1,500,000, received their freedom in two years after the passing of the act of 1861, but without any privilege of acquired land.

It was in connection with the Emancipation Act that the characteristically Russian and purely democratic institution of the *mir* was reëmphasized, as it were, by legislation which fixed the status of the peasant as a member of the self-governing commune. The country remained, as before, divided into *volosti*, or cantons, with villages for their administrative centres. The officers of *volost* and village alike are chosen by universal suffrage, the right to vote being conferred upon all the grown-up men in the community. But the representation is of houses or "fires;" and women who have temporarily lost their husbands are admitted to the deliberations. At the assemblies — generally held on Sundays after mass in the open air — the peasants vote on various matters affecting the interests of the commune, such as the amount of taxes to be levied upon each household, the reallotment of the land held in common by the village, and the transfer of collective land to the status of private property. The officers of the *mir*, presided over by an elder, usually receive pay for their services. An important feature of the Emancipation Act was that it freed the peasants from their subservience to the land-owning class.

The news of emancipation was first given to the public at St. Petersburg, where the imperial manifesto was read from the altar in the various churches. Dzhánshiev tells us that it was "listened to in complete silence, and even with some feeling of consternation. . . . The intelligent classes were disagreeably impressed with the cold and formal tone of the proclamation. Only when the reader came to the sentence 'Make the sign of the cross, thou Orthodox people, and along with us, ask for the blessing of God upon thy free labor, the guarantee of thy domestic well-being and of the public welfare,' — only here did the manifesto produce an impression, for here everyone present impulsively made the sign of the cross."[1] A more lively demonstration was witnessed at the Manézh in St. Petersburg, the Tsar himself being present, for though the people were too much afraid of the police to give expression to the feelings excited in them by the reading of the decree, they vigorously cheered the Emperor. The emancipation manifesto was afterwards promulgated all over Russia, the official announcement of it being made on different days in the various cities of the empire, and being there accompanied by illuminations, entertainments, etc. In many a

[1] *Epokha Velikikh Reform* (Epoch of the Great Reforms), Moscow, 1898.

hamlet and straggling village the news was the signal for popular rejoicing; to many a private dwelling it brought the sudden emotion which could find relief only in tears. Yet there were none the less remote rural districts where it plunged the peasants in a whirl of perplexity and misunderstanding, the outcome of which, in one or two cases, was riots which had to be suppressed by force.

Nor did the reforms of Alexander II. end with the emancipation of the serfs. His manifesto abolishing slavery in Russia was no isolated incident in the progress of Russian culture, but rather part of a great tide of feeling which, carrying the monarch along with it, led to other reforms of high social utility. The conceptions of justice and equality which hitherto only radicals and revolutionists had dared to embody in their programmes were now made the subject of legislative enactments emanating from the government itself. Following upon the measure which freed the peasants came as its complement a series of radical administrative reforms by which the people obtained a considerable measure of self-government. By the law of January, 1864, elective bodies called *zemstva*, or provincial assemblies, were established in various governments of the empire. Meanwhile the former rule of the squires, or landed

gentry, was abolished, a system being substituted which gave representation to the whole land-owning class, private ownership and communal ownership included. Hitherto the judiciary and police administration had been in the hands of officials chosen exclusively by the nobility. In place of ignorant magistrates, trained legal experts were elected to judicial positions, at the same time that the people were admitted, as jurors, to participation in the administration of justice. The public education of the country also underwent improvement. In 1863 the universities were declared independent; in 1864 "real" schools, introducing German educational ideas, were added to the classical schools of the empire. Special provision was also made for the education of women.

We shall see later something of the reaction which came from the generous temper that inspired the Emancipation Act. In some directions, nevertheless, the effect of the decree was lasting and, on the whole, beneficial. Its moral value has never been seriously disputed. The economical results secured by the measure are unquestionable. By removing the artificial conditions which placed an immense body of unpaid labor at the disposal of agriculture, emancipation forced the landlords to a degree of effort and enterprise the necessity of which they had never felt during serfdom. By

throwing the land open to free purchase, the act removed the temptation to spend upon unproductive or poorly productive lands the capital which should be devoted to other forms of industry, at the same time that it operated to advance Russia from the stage of ownership by the commune to the stage of private ownership. Simultaneously with these changes, and also partly as a consequence of them, the abolition of serfdom contributed powerfully to the development of the long-neglected urban life of Russia: a portion, at least, of the liberated serfs thenceforward gave their labor to the development of the cities. Besides, moreover, enabling the peasant to purchase the land he cultivated, the imperial decree liberated him from forced labor. Serfdom in Russia, as in other parts of Europe, had involved various forms of bondage and indebtedness to the land-owning classes. The enslaved peasant had to give work to his manorial lord in the form of the so-called *bárshchina*, or settle his obligation by the *obrók*, or money payment. When the bond was one of labor, it involved three days' toil every week on the lands and in the interest of the proprietor; and it was this form of obligation which the Emancipation Act did away with entirely.

This brief period of reform has been described as the golden age of liberalism in Russia. It was

not only greeted with universal satisfaction: it raised the expectations of the educated classes to the highest pitch. Yet in the very midst of it movements were maturing destined to bring on reaction in its severest forms. One of these had its origin in the discontent of the Poles, who, anticipating the early resuscitation of their country as an independent power, had received the Russian concessions of Alexander II. as a promise of their own speedy deliverance from the painful conditions imposed after their rebellion in the reign of Nicholas. The effort of the authorities in Warsaw to obtain military recruits by force, after the people had been several times fired upon while celebrating patriotic holidays, precipitated a new insurrection (January 15, 1863) in which the Poles, weaker than ever, could maintain little more than a guerilla warfare against the disciplined troops under Muraviév. The revolt, suppressed with great ferocity, resulted in the complete destruction of the remnants of Polish autonomy. The Russian language took the place of Polish in public documents, while the system of Polish education was remodeled on the basis of the Russian university system. Moreover, such Russian reforms as trial by jury, the institution of provincial assemblies, and the improved judicial system, were expressly withheld from the Poles.

VIII

"NIHILISM" AND THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

HAVING disposed of the revolt in Poland, the government of Alexander II. was now free to deal with the much more formidable problem of Russian disaffection. This disaffection was already beginning to take the form which has since become widely known as the "Nihilist movement." The term "Nihilism," as used by Tourguéneff in "Fathers and Children," was originally applied to an intellectual attitude or school of thought. The educated youth of Russia, after coquetting awhile with the philosophy of Schelling and Hegel, had finally come under the influence of the economic radicals of France, such as Louis Blanc and Proudhon, still later of the writings of Buckle, Büchner, Moleschott, and Darwin. This contact with the German and English nature philosophers led in the fifties and sixties to the individualist, otherwise "Nihilist" movement, and through that movement to a revolt of the cultured classes of Russia against the whole fabric of ideas on which

the state religion and the system of government rested in Russia. "Nihilism" was at first simply the intellectual attitude of this revolt. The "Nihilists," in other words, were the bolder spirits of the age who, believing that the time for acquiescing in everything was at an end, had begun to question and challenge everything. Nothing in custom or tradition escaped their destructive criticism; against ideas and institutions based merely on social habit or authority they rebelled with all their might. Even harmless conventionalisms of thought and conduct were placed under the ban by men and women who sought, not only to improve the political and religious institutions of Russia, but also to emancipate themselves as individuals from every obstacle to a healthy moral life. The "Nihilists," as Emerson might have said, were people who, in an age preëminently false, wished to stand in true relations with men, and were willing to do this at the risk of much misunderstanding and of an occasional "fit of insanity." The misunderstanding came in due course, nor was the appearance of mental aberration withheld from the movement. Young people of both sexes there were who, by their exaggerations of speech and dress, perhaps also of conduct, travestied it to the point of folly. The agitation even suffered from the action of men who, like Bakunin, the anarchist,

ignored its constructive quality and made "Nihilism" the synonym for universal destruction. And so in the end, those interested in discrediting the movement for political reform in Russia were able, by calling the reformers "Nihilists," to misrepresent them as people who wished to destroy the foundations of all civilized life.

How far the church and the state in Russia were from being ideally perfect institutions may be gathered from the condition of the family, which the individualist movement did so much to elevate. When the new ideas began to enter Russia in the forties and fifties, the female sex in Russia, so far as the masses of the people were concerned, was still living under the conditions prescribed by the church customs of Byzantine Christianity. From the earliest period of Russian history woman had been treated as a minor, and kept under the perpetual tutelage of some male relative invested with patriarchal authority over her comings and goings. Confined to the *térem*, otherwise called *verkh*, or "upper room," she was carefully isolated from intercourse with strangers. As a wife, she was the slave, literally the property, of her husband. Not only was he permitted to chastise her: the Domostróy, a code of church rules regulating the family life of the people, enjoined him to do so whenever the wife neglected her duty. It even

enumerated cases in which the wife as well as the children could be beaten with the lash, the punishment with this instrument being described as "reasonable and painful, terrible and yet beneficial. If the fault is great, the chastisement must be more severe; while, if the wife does not show any regret, a still severer punishment must be inflicted." Meanwhile every precaution, as enjoined by the Domostróy, was taken to confine the woman strictly to her household duties, and to prevent her from acquiring any but the simplest household arts. No wonder that Kotoshíkhin should write that "the female sex does not know how to read or write," and that while "not lacking natural judgment, they are simply without ideas and shy, since from childhood they live in the seclusion of the *térem*, and only see their relatives." Nor did the reforms of Peter the Great relieve women altogether from the tyranny of the patriarchal system. Even in modern Russia the rigor of parental authority was still exerted in the household; the young girls continued to have their husbands chosen for them; the mournful song of the young wife married against her will, and ill-treated by her tyrannical mother-in-law, survived into the nineteenth century like the echo of a plaint which in its full sadness and despair belonged properly to the fifteenth.

It was the new ideas, first reaching the dwellers of the cities, and only gradually permeating to the country districts, which aroused the more enterprising minds as from a sleep of centuries. One of the earliest results of the awakening was a demand for higher education which could not be satisfied by the schools then in existence. New colleges, together with special "courses," were opened by the government, and to these the young women and men hastened from all parts of Russia. The result was to crowd the university towns with the intellectually active of both sexes. It was here — despite the government prohibition of public meetings — that the educated youth of Russia met to discuss, in the boldest way, the most fundamental questions of religion, society, and national administration. And it was in the ferment of this discussion that the new Russia of the sixties broke forever with the old Russia of the Domostróy and the national church. The bonds of the patriarchal system were now cast off along with the religious beliefs under whose authority they had been so long maintained. Not only did the women, rejecting parental tyranny, assert their freedom in matters of the heart — they claimed the right to enter the professions hitherto open only to men. Hence it came about that, besides having a "woman's question" on its hands, Russia soon witnessed the

influx of women into various professional occupations, as journalists, teachers, doctors, nurses, etc.

The time had now come for the reformers, under the stress of modern conditions, and with such means as they could command, to take up once more the cause championed by the Decembrists in the days of Nicholas. The people, it must be remembered, were still burdened with a political system which denied them the commonest political rights; with administrative police methods under which men and women could be exiled or otherwise punished without the slightest form of trial; and with a censorship by means of which the activities of the press could be suspended or prohibited altogether for "offenses" not recognized as such in the countries of western Europe. Besides these general grievances, the cultured and student classes had wrongs of their own. Perhaps the most important of them were the obstacles thrown in the way of their education by the government itself. Finding that the colleges and universities were developing forms of liberal thought hostile to its methods, the administration made an effort to suppress these tendencies by imposing restrictions and penalties upon the "offenders." It disciplined the broad-minded professor by dismissing him from his position; it either harassed the student by a system of espionage and excessive "regulation" within

the university, or it gave power to the rector to dismiss him before he had earned the diploma on which he counted to make his way in the world. The individuals thus deprived of a career naturally went to swell the ranks of the disaffected, and there were thus added to the forces of the revolutionary movement men who had a personal as well as a political interest in conspiring against autocratic government in Russia.

Meanwhile the emancipation of the peasants in 1861 had given an immense stimulus to the demand for participation of the people in the task of national administration. Popular feeling on the subject was shown by the action of the assemblies of nobility in Moscow, Smolensk, and Tver, who had at once petitioned for a constitution. A year later a body calling itself the "Central Revolutionary Committee" issued a proclamation declaring that the blood of the Románovs must answer for the wretchedness of the people. The government thereupon seized the pretext of some extensive incendiary fires in St. Petersburg to close all the clubs and societies at which the discontented classes had been accustomed to assemble. In Kazán the members of a revolutionary society were punished with imprisonment, exile, or death — five being shot or hanged — for having issued appeals to the people. On April 16, 1866, Kara-

kásov, the delegate of a revolutionary club, fired at the Emperor as he was leaving the Summer Garden, but missed his aim owing to the promptitude of a peasant. Reactionary government measures were at once taken, among them being a complete reorganization of the educational establishments with a view to rooting out disaffection at its source. In the belief that the prevailing discontent was due to science — to the independence of thought fostered by scientific studies — the new minister of public education, Count Dmitry A. Tolstóy, introduced an educational programme in which the chief emphasis was laid upon Greek and Latin, to the almost complete exclusion of the natural sciences. The dislike of the Russian mind for the classics — its tendency to scientific realism — made the new programme odious, rendered Tolstóy exceedingly unpopular, and within the colleges and universities fostered the very discontent which it was the object of the new policy to remove.

The organizing of conspiracies, such as that of Necháyev, broken up by the police in 1869, occupied the next few years. Finally, at the beginning of the seventies, recognizing the disinclination of the peasants to take part in the movement against authority, the revolutionists determined to give themselves to the task of educating and or-

ganizing the masses of the people. There was something naïve in the supposition that the whole mental tendencies of millions of peasants, scattered over an empire of enormous extent, could be radically changed in a few years of propaganda by a few thousand propagandists; yet once the decision had been taken, the plan of "going to the people" was promptly put into practice, and from 1872 to 1875 there went on in European Russia a movement such as was never heard of anywhere else, and could have been possible in no other country of the world. In all sorts of guises and disguises — as teachers, doctors, nurses, and as workmen and artisans — the pilgrims of the revolution left the cities for the country districts; amid all sorts of personal hardships, as well as at great personal risk, they sought to inspire the people with revolutionary views. How incautiously they went to work is shown by the ease with which the government suppressed the movement. In three years, after many of the propagandists had been arrested and sentenced, the agitation was at an end. It had done little or nothing to weaken the loyalty of the peasants. All it had accomplished was to reveal the capacity of the Russian nature for self-sacrifice in the pursuit of ideal ends, and to suggest to the administration the wisdom of utilizing, in activities advantageous

to the state, the energies which had thus been spent in the effort to arouse disaffection among the people.

But the Russian government, instead of taking the suggestion, proceeded to irritate the educated classes by sweeping measures of retaliation. The system of private denunciation, which placed people at the mercy of their personal enemies, and gave no opportunity of defense, was so widely extended as to subject its victims to imprisonment and exile on a mere suspicion of their "political infidelity." Under the operation of the administrative system, which denied the right to a public accusation and trial, thousands of young people of both sexes were sent to Siberia for no other reason than because their names happened to be on the books of the police as politically disaffected. Even when charges were made, the most trivial "offenses" sufficed to send the accused to penal servitude in Siberia for a period of from ten to twelve years. It is therefore not much to be wondered at that the terrorism of the government should have so soon turned the revolutionists from the more peaceful forms of agitation into the path of open and unremitting violence. One of the first results of the new policy was the shooting of a number of police spies, whom the terrorists "executed" in various parts of Russia between

1876 and 1879. On February 5, 1878, a young woman, Viera Sasúlich, fired at and wounded General Trépov, police prefect at St. Petersburg, for ordering a student named Bogolyúbov to be flogged. As under the circumstances the punishment was illegal even according to Russian law, the sympathies of the Russian people were with Bogolyúbov and the avenger of his wrong. The girl had herself suffered from the operation of the administrative system; on being tried by a jury, she was at once acquitted. Outside the court room the police made an effort to re-arrest her, but the crowd saved her from capture, and she was enabled, not only to escape, but also to make her way across the frontier into western Europe.

"Hunger strikes" now began in the Fortress of Peter and Paul at St. Petersburg, and in the Central Prison at Khárkov, undertaken by the "politicals" in both for the purpose of compelling better treatment of men at the hands of the prison authorities. On August 16, 1878, after Kaválsky had been shot at Odessa by order of a military tribunal, General Mésentsev, chief of the "Third Section," held responsible in popular opinion for the hunger strikes, was assassinated in the Nevsky Prospékt, at St. Petersburg. The government at once took from juries the purview of all political crimes, and henceforth provided for the

trial of these cases by military tribunals. The first sensational incident of the following year, 1879, was the shooting, by Goldenberg, of Prince Kropótkin, governor of Khárkov, for having ill-treated prisoners under his care. On April 14, an ex-teacher named Soloviév fired five shots at the Emperor without hitting him. The authorities now fell into a state of panic. The Tsar, besides appealing to the forces of society for support, granted extraordinary powers to the police for the suppression of the terrorists. A system of national defense was intrusted to General Gourko at St. Petersburg, Loris Mélikov at Khárkov, and General Todtleben at Odessa. In St. Petersburg the house porters were charged with the duty of watching over domiciles and their inmates in the function of detectives. During the panic, in the metropolis alone, some 60,000 persons were arrested and exiled by administrative process.

In reply the revolutionists organized a conspiracy whose immediate purpose was the slaying of the Emperor. Sentence of death was passed upon him by an "executive committee," and in November, 1879, an effort was made to carry out the sentence on the occasion of the Tsar's return from the Crimea, by mining the railway at three points — Moscow, Odessa, and Alexándrovsk. All the at-

tempts failed, the Moscow explosion, prepared by Hartmann, Sophia Peróvskaya, Goldenberg, and others, taking effect on the wrong train. On January 26, 1880, the "executive committee" in a formal declaration made a series of demands, — the right of free thought in religious matters, complete freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of organization and of public meeting, the right of the people to be represented in the government, the right of universal suffrage, and several other reforms. Three weeks later (February 17, 1880) an explosion was contrived in the Winter Palace by one Khalturin, who had obtained work in the building as a decorator; but, owing to the late arrival of the guests, the Tsar again escaped injury. Yet the explosion did not occur without loss of life, since in the room below the dining-hall, and just above the place where the dynamite had been stored, some sixty guardsmen were killed and forty wounded. The "executive committee" at once issued a statement, regretting the useless loss of life, but announcing the purpose of the revolutionists to continue their struggle until the government granted a representative assembly.

Loris Mélikov was now made dictator, with special powers of dealing with the situation. Instead of devoting himself exclusively to the development of a policy of rigorous repression, Mélikov, recog-

nizing the need of obtaining for the administration the support of the people, set himself to the task of conciliating public opinion by concessions. A large number of exiles, banished for trivial offenses, were permitted to return from Siberia or from distant provinces; dismissed employees were reinstated; and some two thousand students were returned to their desks in the universities from which, for longer or shorter periods, they had been temporarily excluded. Meanwhile Mélikov had drawn up a scheme for the calling of deputies together from the various local governing bodies, and had induced the Emperor to give it his consideration. This scheme, in the excitement of the time, was supposed to embody a plan for a national representative assembly; yet it was really no more than a proposal to give the deputies summoned certain consultative functions in regard to projects of law. The Tsar, moreover, never gave his sanction to the Mélikov scheme — he did nothing more than arrange for its discussion by his council of ministers. This discussion was to have taken place on March 17, but the unfortunate Emperor did not live to take part in it. On the afternoon of March 13, 1881, he was fatally injured while passing in his carriage, accompanied by a few mounted Cossacks, along the Catherine Canal. Six conspirators awaited him there with bombs.

The signal for the assassination was given by Sophia Peróvskaya, a young girl of aristocratic family, daughter of the governor-general of St. Petersburg. The first missile thrown merely shattered the carriage; the second, launched by Grinevétsky (who was fatally wounded by the bomb), so injured the Emperor that he died soon after his arrival at the Winter Palace. A month later, after trial and condemnation before a military tribunal, the assassins — Zhelyábov, Peróvskaya, Kibalchich, Mikháilov, and Ryssakóv — were driven on tumbrils to the Simeónovsky Square, and hanged. In its proclamation to the new ruler, the "executive committee," which had authorized the assassination, renewed its demand for a representative assembly, and promised unconditional submission to any government which such an assembly might sanction.

Alexander III., son of the "Tsar Liberator" (1881–94), — described by intimates as a man of powerful physique, great industry, but limited intellectual calibre, — took up without hesitation the reins of power wrested by revolutionary violence from the hands of his father. He seemed at first disposed to carry out the arrangement for the discussion of the Mélikov scheme; but under the influence of conservative advisers, the proposals were finally "shelved." And when, on the

occasion of the delayed coronation ceremony, the new Tsar was asked by the cultured classes, through Professor Chichérin, for a share in the work of national administration, the only reply vouchsafed was a new epoch of reaction, signalized by relentless severity towards the press, by the formation of a "Holy League" designed to combat the machinations of the "Nihilists," and by a policy of centralization and nationalization in the course of which well-nigh every form of dissent in the empire was subjected to persecution. It was in this reign, moreover, that the autonomous government granted to the Baltic provinces by Peter the Great was completely broken up, in respect not only of its laws and customs, but also of its religion and language. Measures were meanwhile begun for the abolition of the constitution of Finland, and for the complete incorporation of the Grand Duchy into the Russian empire.

The revolutionary movement had in the meanwhile passed from the acute stage which it assumed towards the end of the seventies into those milder, though wider and deeper manifestations of discontent which have since characterized the agitation. Yet its grievances and protests continued to challenge the attention of the civilized world. Thus in the spring of 1889, a party of political exiles were fired upon at Yakútsk by their guard,

six of them being killed and nine dangerously wounded. In November of the same year, Madame Hope Sigída, a political prisoner confined at Karâ, Siberia, was so unmercifully flogged by the prison authorities that she died two days afterwards. Two women in the same ward, on hearing of the flogging, poisoned themselves, and died in consequence. In 1890 a beautiful and accomplished young girl named Sophia Gunzburg, condemned to death for having taken part in the drawing up of a revolutionary proclamation, committed suicide in a Russian prison. It was also in 1890 that a talented lady named Tsébrikova was punished with a period of exile for having, from a foreign country, forwarded to the Tsar a petition asking for reforms.

The death of Alexander III., on November 1, 1894, aroused much hope in the minds of the Russian reformers, since his son and successor, Nicholas II., who had already made one journey round the world, came to the throne with a reputation for liberal views apparently full of promise for the future of the Russian people. But the new ruler, though he began by dismissing the unpopular Gourko from the governor-generalship of Poland, did not justify the expectations which had been formed of him. And when the opportunity came to announce his attitude towards the question of a

constitution for Russia, he did not hesitate to dash the hopes of those who had looked to him for a "new departure" in the national annals. The occasion was that of an address by the provincial assembly of Tver, in which he was asked to admit the people to a share in the responsibilities of government. Nicholas II. replied, with emphasis and deliberation, "I am aware that in certain meetings of the provincial assemblies, voices have lately been raised by persons carried away by absurd illusions about the participation of the members of such assemblies in matters of internal government. Let all know that, in devoting all my strength to the welfare of the people, I intend to protect the principle of autocracy as firmly and unswervingly as did my late and never-to-be-forgotten father." Besides, moreover, refusing the request of the provincial assembly of Tver, the new ruler also rejected another petition of even greater significance, since it was the first request of a similar kind ever made by peasants of Russia.

The most reactionary event in the reign of Nicholas II. has been the abrogation of the constitution of Finland, recognized and reaffirmed since 1809 by every Russian monarch on his accession to the throne. In the early part of 1899, Nicholas drew to himself the attention of the intellectual

and philanthropic everywhere by his praiseworthy effort to promote the world's peace. His famous "rescript," making proposals to the Powers for a reduction of armaments, resulted in the Peace Congress at the Hague.

IX

THE RELIGIOUS PROTEST

ACCOUNT must now be taken of another revolt, maintained since the seventeenth century by the dissenters of Russia, — men and women who, while joining in no political movement against the autocratic form of government in Russia, have none the less thrown off their allegiance to the Orthodox Church which that form of administration supports, and have never ceased to protest against the effort made by the state to deprive them of the right to freedom of thought in religious matters. The two forms of protest — the religious and the political — apparently have little in common; yet there is a connection between them which, in spite of their differences of aim, cannot be ignored. It is at least the connection between two bodies of enemies who, although not conjoined in any way, and working independently, are attacking the same fortress. But it is also something more. For if it be held that the sectarians are only opposing the religious system of Russia, it may also be urged that the revolutionists attack autocracy

in both state and church, and seek to bring about changes which will give Russia religious as well as political freedom. The two movements, therefore, being alike protests against absolutism in state and church, are connected, if by no other bond, by an alliance of interest which is vastly more significant than, without it, any merely formal union could be between the forces of political and of religious reform.

But to understand the meaning of the religious situation in Russia to-day, when large bodies of sectarians are being driven over sea to foreign countries on account of their religious opinions, we must glance at the conditions in which it originated more than three centuries ago. The first considerable outbreak of religious heresy in Russia took place just before the advent of Peter the Great, and while essentially a protest against the authority of the state in religious matters, was precipitated by an effort, with the aid of the new learning of western Europe, to revise the texts of the church books, many passages in which — through the mistakes of copyists, incorrect renderings, and even interpolated sentences and paragraphs — had become both misleading and injurious. It was the Tsar Vassily Ivánovich who first issued orders for the needed emendation of the sacred books and liturgies. The task was

intrusted to Maxim the Greek, but his work was soon rendered abortive by popular prejudice, a charge of perverting the church texts finally landing the monk in a cloister. The Patriarch Joseph, who next undertook to make the needed corrections, failed through ignorance of the original texts. At last the Patriarch Níkon took up in the seventeenth century the work begun in the sixteenth, and having obtained the assistance of ecclesiastical experts, carefully compared the church books with the original Greek manuscripts. Níkon not only corrected inaccuracies, but was enabled to discover and strike out many doubtful and spurious passages. His revision had the sanction of the Tsar and of two ecclesiastical councils. On its completion, the revised texts were issued in printed form, and their use was made obligatory upon the people.

But the popular mind was in no condition to accept unquestioningly these results of western scholarship. It looked upon the sacred texts with much the same superstitious awe as that with which a savage regards a bit of bark upon which a magic formula has been written; and any change in the text of the church books, especially when wrought by men versed in the "unholy" knowledge of the West, was viewed as sacrilege. A large section of the people would have none

of the revision, and its repudiation of Níkon's work at once brought about what has since been known in the Russian annals as the *raskól* — the schism or "split" in the church. The schismatics, who called themselves alternately "Old Believers" and "Old Ritualists," originally differed from their Orthodox brethren mainly in trivial matters. They insisted, for example, in making the sign of the cross with two, instead of three fingers; they sang the Hallelujah thrice instead of twice; they celebrated the mass with seven prosforas instead of with five; they retained the cross with eight branches instead of the cross with four; and they spelled the name of Christ "Issus" instead of "Iissus." In other words, they retained those features in which the Russian Church resembled the Greek Church, and rejected the divergences from the latter which Níkon had introduced. It is in these various respects, moreover, that the Old Believers differ even at the present day from the Orthodox Church. But there was a time when the schism meant more than a protest against mere trivialities. For when Peter the Great sanctioned usages which were obnoxious to the schismatics and prohibited others which they favored, the dissent of the day expanded into a form of opposition to the state itself. Rejecting impartially the permissions and

the prohibitions of Peter; championing the beard, which he had ordered to be shaved, and the old Russian dress, which he wished to abolish; denouncing the tobacco which he had introduced largely as a means of revenue as well as the coffee, tea, and sugar which he had brought in to contribute to an improved social condition — the Old Believers waged unrelenting war upon the whole body of European reforms, and having reached the conclusion that every feature of the machinery of government, from the taking of the census to the keeping of a registry of births and deaths, was essentially evil in its purpose and nature, they carried their antagonism to the extreme of attributing the miserable condition of the country to the machinations of an anti-Christ Tsar.

The effort to suppress the schism began under the Tsar who initiated the revision, for Alexéi punished the dissenters not only with loss of civil privileges, but also with imprisonment and with exile. Under Peter the Great they were persecuted with relentless severity. The tolerance granted by Catherine the Great resulted in an enormous increase in their numbers. The schism had by this time developed into two forms of dissent, one constituting a church organization without priests, known as the "Priestless Sects," the other a body of religionists who retained the

institution of the priesthood under the name of the "Hierarchists." It was under Catherine (1771) that the dissenters received permission by charter to establish a hospital and cemetery for the use of their co-religionists, and were thus for the first time formally recognized by the state. In the next year two centres of the schism were founded by two divisions of the Old Believers, — one at Rogozhsky by the Hierarchists, the other at Preobrazhénsky by the Priestless Sects, — and these have remained to this day. The consent of the Holy Synod to the ordination of priests who were to officiate in accordance with the ritual of the Old Believers was finally granted in 1800. From the reign of Paul to that of Elizabeth, the policy pursued by the authorities towards the dissenters was one of alternating favor and severity. In the reign of Nicholas I. the Hierarchists obtained an episcopate on Austrian, adjoining Russian territory; but here they came so grievously into disrepute that it was deemed advisable to confiscate their buildings and property, and replace their officiating clergy by priests of the Orthodox faith. On the return of tolerance under Alexander III. the dissenters recovered their prestige. To-day the Old Believers who call themselves Hierarchists boast of some fifteen sees in various parts of the empire, with archbishops at Moscow and Kazán.

The Priestless division of the schism, with no ministers, but only "elders," has resulted rather in a striking development of sub-sects than in any foundation which can properly be called a church. The peculiar views held by this division, as illustrated by leading sects such as the "Theodosians" and the "Philippians" in their rejection of the sacraments, as well as of the priesthood, have brought out radical views on the subject of family life, together with a not infrequent resort to immoral practices. Yet there are also sects in this division whose members, living lives of purity, carry to an extreme their ascetic doctrine that the relations of the sexes are inherently evil. In the case of one group, that of the "Pilgrims," the believer gives up his family and previous associations in order to live a wandering life in the forest. The "Mutes" are believed to represent the "Pilgrim" heresy in an especially disgruntled form. Then there are fanatical sects some of whom feel themselves called upon to choke or club to death new-born babes in order to save them from contact with a sinful world; while others, regarding suicide as their only safety, starve themselves to death, burn themselves alive, or leap from high cliffs into the sea.

So much for the dissent in Russia which can be directly connected with the great religious revolt

of the seventeenth century. We now come to the general movement of revolt against religious Orthodoxy in Russia, — a movement which presents Russian dissent in its most active and vital forms. In the schism the Russian mind is prevailingly conservative, since the schismatics, properly so called, while their desire is for religious freedom, wish to use that freedom simply in a return to the past of their church and its observances. The general movement of dissent, on the other hand, — that which has been developed independently of Níkon and his reforms, — is made up of a body of schismatics who, by their activity in innovation, may be said to represent the spirit of religious variation, if not of religious progress in Russia. Latent in the church ever since the introduction of Christianity under Vladímir, this movement has never ceased to manifest itself, now as reversion to the original paganism of the people, and now as the survival or recrudescence of early Christian heresies brought into the country by travelers or by merchants. In modern times, some of the most popular phases of dissent may be traced to the initiative of the individual peasant who, aided by his active imagination and a fresh interpretation of scriptural texts, has rarely found it difficult to call together a band of followers, and thus to form a new sect.

In this free play of the religious mind all forms of dissent — the whimsical and eccentric, as well as the sober and rational — attain to more or less of organized expression. The now well-known "Dukhobórtsy," or "Spirit-Wrestlers," large numbers of whom have been forced by the Russian government into exile, constitute one of the sects which manifest the so-called "rational tendencies." The members of this sect disbelieve in "spirit," and deny the existence of a personal God, saying that God is in the society of pious men, and exists individually in every good man. By an extension of this attitude, they also deny the divinity of Christ, whom they regard as simply possessing the excellences embodied in any other superlatively good man. The Dukhobórtsy refuse to recognize the authority of the Bible, and reject the Orthodox views regarding heaven and hell. Repudiating the ritual and creeds of the Orthodox Church, they oppose the authority and many of the regulations of the state. They hold it to be sinful to perform military service, and discountenance war in all its aspects. They refuse to pray for the Tsar, and deny his authority over them. Much more numerous than the Dukhobórtsy, yet closely allied to them in beliefs, are the "Milk Drinkers," — a sect which has acquired its name from the fact that its members refuse to obey the

church in its prohibition of milk on certain days in the calendar. Having no priests they are presided over by elders or brothers; they accept the parents' blessing in place of a marriage ceremony, adopt the Bible as their guide, and regard as their chief maxim the sentence, "God is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth."

One of the evangelical sects of Russia which has attained to wide development in the south is known as the "Stunda," the doctrines of which seem to connect its members with the Baptists of the West. The sect originated in the neighborhood of Odessa, and took its name from the *stunden*, or "hours" which the earliest of its members spent in the society of such German colonists as happened to be solicitous concerning their spiritual welfare. The Stundists have no clergy, attach no value to the sacraments, and have given up observing the holidays of the church. Their religious gatherings are remarkable for the simplicity of the service. Under the presidency of an elder brother, they sing together, and hear chapters read from the Bible. There is no religious superior at these meetings whose authority is regarded as preëminent; all present have equal title, and are held equally qualified to comment upon the Scriptures and give instruction in them. The Stundists carry into their daily life, where

women enjoy equal rights with men, the same democratic ideas as those which find illustration in their religious observances. As a community, the members of the sect are noted all over Russia for their honesty, sobriety, cleanliness, thrift. The Stunda first appeared as a sect of small dimensions at Raslopol in the latter end of the sixties; it is now known throughout southern Russia as one of the most thriving and prosperous of the evangelical sects. Its founder was the peasant Michael Ratúshny.

The general body of dissent in Russia contains mysticism, as well as rationalism and evangelicism. Among the most widely known of the "Mystics" are the "Flagellants," also called "People of God," from a designation given by themselves. The members of this sect meet by preference at night in some secluded place, clothed in white garments. Hymns are sung, and chapters read from the Bible. When the proper degree of excitement has been aroused, the worshipers begin a circling dance, which gradually increases in speed until, intoxicated and finally exhausted by the motion, they drop one by one to the floor. The power of prophecy then descends upon them, and the words they utter under its influence are claimed to be fraught with the highest importance; in the state of trance, the "sensitive" is believed

to be inspired by the Holy Ghost. Should the necessary exaltation not be forthcoming, the members lash themselves into a frenzy, and it is from this practice that they take their name. The Flagellants eschew fermented drinks, forbid marriage, enjoin strictest sexual purity, and put a ban upon all forms of oath-taking. The sect is said to have received its unwritten faith from God himself, incarnated as Daniel Philipóvich, on the summit of a mountain in the government of Vladímir; it is from this human incarnation that the Flagellants inherit what they call their twelve commandments. There is also a legend concerning the birth and crucifixion of their first Christ, one Iván Timoféyevich. The charge of immoral practices, sometimes brought against the Flagellants, seems to have had more justification in the case of the "Jumpers," an allied sect which first came into prominence in the suburbs of St. Petersburg.

Among the miscellaneous sects of Russia may be mentioned the "Communists," differing from the Milk Drinkers only by holding property in common; the "Non-Prayers," an extreme division of the Priestless Sects; the "Sabbatists;" the "Chísleniki," who have their Sunday on Wednesday; the "Samobógi," who regard men as gods; the "Dancers;" the "Sighers," etc. Most of the

sects have their founders, prophets, Madonnas, and Christs, their Bethlehems and their Nazareths. Thus Kapústin was the law-giver, and Pobirókhin the prophet, of the Dukhobórtsy; Michael Ratúshny is revered as the founder of the Stunda; the Milk Drinkers, founded by Uklein, also remember Pópov as their apostle and Grigórov as their preacher; Iván Súslov labored as the "Christ" of the Flagellants, and is said to have undergone resurrection; Xenia Ivánovna uttered prophecies for the "Ascetics;" Adrian Pushkin was the Messiah of the "Sons of God;" Selivánov was recognized as the "true God" of the "Self-Mutilators;" Anna Románovna played her part as the priestess of the "Eunuchs;" and Madame Tatárinov officiated as leader of a sect of fashionable Mystics meeting in St. Petersburg. Among the still living apostles of popular dissent may be mentioned the evangelist peasant Sutáyev, who describes Christianity as "charity," and aims at the "organization of a Christian life;" and the famous writer Tolstóy, who, denying the soul's survival after death, also translates the meaning of religion into terms of social life, and works for a salvation which is to be realized in the world which we now inhabit rather than in some future condition of existence.

What, finally, is the modern attitude of the

Russian state towards the dissenters under its control? The fact that these now number between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 makes the question one of importance for Christendom in general. That the schism proper has finally emerged from the persecution which was originally its normal lot we have already seen. By decrees dated 1883 and 1884, Alexander III. gave the Old Believers freedom to worship in accordance with their own rites. Yet various harassing restrictions still remain. Thus the schismatics are not permitted to build chapels with their own money, and cannot receive bequests made in their favor. Their priests may be expelled and their prayer books suppressed. Still greater restrictions and hardships press upon the general body of Russian dissenters whose schism has been developed independently of the revolt which followed upon the reforms of Níkon. They are not only liable to be proceeded against at any moment as "anti-social," "dangerous," and "disloyal:" for years they have been subjected to active persecution by the authorities. In the reign of Alexander III., several of the sects, especially the Milk Drinkers and the Stundists, were treated with great harshness. The official war waged against the Dukhobórtsy, begun in the reign of Alexander III. and continued under Nicholas II., has had the effect of forcing

considerable bodies of this sect over sea into such places of exile as could be secured for them in the United States and Canada.

It is to be borne in mind that the law of Russia not only forbids the Orthodox from changing their religious faith — it punishes the offense with the loss of all civil rights, and even permits an offender's property to be taken possession of by his relatives. No proselytism is allowed in any other interest than that of the Orthodox Church. Desertion of the church is a crime, and it becomes the duty of a father, of a mother, or of other relatives to inform against the deserter. It is under laws such as these that the government authorities, coöperating with the Holy Synod and its chief procurator Pobyedonóstsev, have inflicted upon the Roman Catholics of Poland, the Uniats of Russia and Poland, the Lutherans of the Baltic provinces, and the German Mennonites, various forms of persecution for religious opinion. The treatment of the Jews, carried out not only unofficially by anti-Semitic mobs, but also officially in the summer and autumn of 1882, under the authority of the notorious "May Laws," as well as of subsequent decrees signed by the Emperor himself, was such as to call forth the condemnation of the civilized world. It is said that between April of 1881 and June of 1882 no fewer than 225,000 Jewish fami-

lies, comprising over a million souls, were forced to leave Russia under circumstances for the most part of inconceivable hardship. Nor have the laws which compelled this migration undergone any important change. Under Nicholas II., as under Alexander III., the Jews are subject to restrictions imposed upon no other race or body of religionists in the empire. Compelled to reside in the southwestern governments known as the Pale, they live there under the stress of untold hardship, constantly recruit the ranks of pauperism, and in towns already overcrowded fall an easy prey to hunger and disease. Industrial and social disabilities block their path in every direction. Perhaps the most cruel of all the prohibitions from which this gifted and ambitious race suffers in Russia is the intellectual prohibition, since by means of a law which admits to the gymnasia and universities a proportion of only three to five per cent of Hebrew students, the Jews are deprived of educational opportunities granted everywhere abroad, and to people of other races and faiths even in Russia.

Such, then, is the religious situation in the empire; and as we recall its chief features, we shall find it impossible to avoid the conclusion that, as in the political, so in the religious aspect of its life, Russia is living in the Middle Ages. To

expect it to nourish a religious life like that of the West would be to ignore the plain facts. For the Russia of to-day, with its forest regions, its continental climate, its vast and isolating distances, is preëminently the country of a primitive religion. Nor is it too much to say that the masses who occupy its uniform plains, bound from generation to generation in the toils of the same monotonous labor, and deprived of everything save the mere glimmer of our modern knowledge which they get in the sight of a locomotive or of an agricultural implement — as utterly "vacant of our glorious gains" as if they were living in Thibet — that such a people, in all that relates to religious belief and practice, are little removed from the condition of which the stories about classical Greece and Rome remind us. They have scarcely yet outgrown what might be called the stage of inflexion in religion, — the period of mental development in which spirits and deities are assigned by the imagination to all the great classes of appearances in nature which suggest supernatural power. Hence, though monotheism is the avowed faith of the Orthodox Church, the Russian peasant continues to believe more or less in the original polytheism of his pagan ancestors. He does not name the various divinities, and may not hold them consciously apart in his mind; yet he finds their

chief characters again in the attributes which he has been taught to associate with the principal saints of the Christian calendar. As seen, moreover, in his superstitions, in those spirit invocations and magic formulæ which form so considerable a part of popular literature, he continues to believe in the existence of that same spirit world which Grand-Prince Vladímir, by a mere ceremony of baptism, vainly supposed that he could banish forever from the Russian land.

As the conditions of life in Russia have determined the character of its people, so the people have in turn determined the character of the church and the state. As the peasants give their "practical consent" to the autocracy, enabling it to survive in defiance of the aspirations of the cultured minority, so do they give a similar consent to the existence of the Orthodox Church, and by doing this, secure the perpetuation of creeds and beliefs which to the advanced mind of Russia have become, not only antipathetic, but even intolerable. The situation is thus one which is exploited to the utmost by the ruling class. Strong in the knowledge that absolutism in both church and state is sanctioned by the great body of the people, the autocracy can afford to ignore the religious as well as the political needs of the educated minority. Maintaining that demand for absolute uniformity

of belief which is a character of the older, and not of the newer civilizations, Russia regards religious disloyalty as equally wicked and injurious with political disloyalty, and continues to punish people, as they did in the Middle Ages, for even trivial divergences from the religious creeds and practices imposed by the state. And while it regards the existing institutions as satisfactorily supplying the church wants of the common people, it makes no provision for the higher religious needs of the educated classes.

It is this practical denial of religion to culture in Russia which must be held responsible for any justification there may be in the charge of irreligiousness so often brought against the movement for constitutional reform. In western Europe and in the United States, the educated classes have unlimited opportunities of decision as to what particular religious faith is worthy of their allegiance. Unable to coöperate with one church, the religionist has a hundred others — each a degree more liberal or more conservative that the rest — from which he may make his choice. But in Russia a chasm yawns between the religious system which the state thrusts upon its educated minority and the ideal faith which its members would be likely to join were religious thought free. And this chasm is made impassable by the pains and penal-

ties with which the state chains its subjects to the faith of the national church. So that in Russia an educated man must choose between Orthodoxy and absolute unbelief; between membership of a church which, with its iconostases, its relics and holy icons, recalls the religious traditions of the fifteenth century, and that absolute withdrawal from all religious observances which is not infrequently met with in the political radical of Russia who, rejecting absolutism in the state, has been forced to give it up also in the church. It is perhaps one of the most serious features of the situation that many make this choice in such a way as to intensify rather than lessen the existing antagonism of interest between the head and the heart of Russia — between the classes upon whom the nation must depend for its progress and the populations who supply the power on which rests the autocratic system in both church and state.

X

THE STORY OF RUSSIAN EXPANSION

So much for the internal development of the Russian state. We have now to glance at the extraordinary way in which the energies of that state have been devoted to the work of colonization. The Russian Slav was a pioneer by racial habit even in the days of the Varyágs. The earlier expansion in European Russia was begun by the soldier, the colonist, and the peasant long before the government of the country had reached its final form. Under the *udyélny* system, settlement by conquest or peaceful colonization went on over large tracts of territory to the north and east. This movement, while it formed a splendid preparation for the more durable forms of nation-building that were to follow, could have no more than a temporary character, for when the *udyélny* system fell to pieces, and the autocratic form of government took its place, Russia had to make a new territorial as well as a new political beginning. The country now shrank to a fragment of its former self; and from the mere nucleus of empire known in

the times of Daniel as the principality of Moscow, there began that wonderful process by which — through the action, first, of grand-princes on the way to becoming autocrats, and finally of the representatives of a tsardom fully constituted, one of whom, Iván the Third, went into national annals as the "gatherer" of the Russian earth — all the territories previously acquired by the republics, or by the *udyélny* princes, were one by one reacquired and added to the dominions of Muscovy. But the process was by no means rounded off in the absorption of lands which had originally belonged to men of Russian nationality. It went on also at the expense of foreign peoples. Thus, in the reign of Peter the Great, at the peace of Nystadt in 1721, Russia took from the Swedes as her share Livonia, Esthonia, Ingria, and a part of Karelia. By the partition of Poland, partly accomplished in the administration of Catherine the Great, and completed in 1815, Russia absorbed the territories known as White-Russia, Lithuania, Podolia, Little-Russia (including the Ukraine), and eastern Poland. Finland, as far as the Tornea, was ceded to Alexander I. in 1809 by the peace of Fredrikshamn; in the same reign (1812), Russia acquired Bessarabia by the treaty of Bukharest. The bulk of the territory in and about the Caucasus, with its picturesque

scenery and strange races, passed from Persia to Russia during the reigns of Alexander I. and Nicholas I.

No more than a few centuries were needed for the people of Russia to fill up the plain west of the Ural Mountains; and a less virile race would have been content to remain within the boundaries thus apparently marked out for them by nature. We have only to glance at the statue of Yermák, in which the sculptor Antakólsky seems to have given us, not merely the sturdy, thick-set frame, the broad shoulders, the intelligent countenance, and the keen glance of the Cossack chieftain who discovered Siberia, but also, perhaps, the typical physical traits of the Russian pioneer in the far east, to realize how little a chain of mountains, or even the sea itself, would be likely to stay the march of men who were migrants by racial habit, and whose settlements in European Russia had been little more than resting places by the way. One does not wonder, therefore, to find that the enterprising Novgorodians, if only for purposes of barter, had crossed the Urals in advance of Yermák, or that as early as 1499 the Muscovites had penetrated with an armed force as far as the river Ob. Yet before the sixteenth century there had been no effort to settle in the country. The first attempt to gain a foothold by conquest came

through the enterprise of a merchant named Stróganov, to whom Tsar Iván the Terrible had granted certain rights in connection with a tract of land on the banks of the Kama. Among the men who entered his service was one Yermák Timoféyevich, originally a river pirate, who had escaped from the Volga with the more daring of his followers. And it was to Yermák that the Stróganovs intrusted the charge of an expedition to the land of Yugra, celebrated for its furs. Yermák set forth on New Year's Day, 1581, at the head of a force of 800 men, armed with cannon and arquebuses. The chieftain traversed the Urals, made his way eastward, attacked the Tatar khan Kuchum, and carried by assault his chief city, Sibir, from which the country afterwards took its name. The success of Yermák created much excitement in Moscow, and the Tsar, who had shown displeasure on hearing of the expedition, sent a military leader, with a body of militia, to take charge of the conquered territory. Sibir afterwards dwindled in importance, and finally disappeared; but the Russian settlement was maintained, and the city of Tobólsk, founded in 1587, sixteen versts from the scene of Yermák's victory, was the beginning of a colonizing movement which has since had the whole of Siberia for its field.

The colonists first took the northern routes in

order to avoid the resistance offered to their advance by hostile tribes to the south. Navigating the embranching rivers by means of long, raft-like vessels, — afloat for a month or two in the brief Siberian summer, and then for the long winter season almost buried beneath snow, their log huts distinguishable from the more primitive dwelling of the aborigine only by the raised wooden cross, — the hardy Cossacks, building their forts at the confluences of the streams as they went, little by little extended the dominion of Russia in a vast territory hitherto wholly unexplored. In 1593 we find them at Berézov, far up towards the mouth of the Ob; by 1618–20 they have left settlements on the Yeniséi, and founded the city of Yeniséisk. Discovering the Lena River, they build in 1632 the fort which afterwards becomes the town of Yakútsk; the explorers reach the river Kolyma thence in 1645. The first Cossack "Thalassa! Thalassa!" must have burst from the throats of the pioneers in 1636, for it was in that year that they came within sight of the Pacific at the Sea of Ókhotsk. A fort was built on this sea in 1647 by Iván Afanásiev, after a fierce struggle with the aborigines. The founding of Irkútsk near Lake Baikal, in the year 1661, gave Russia a station which has since become the great emporium of Asiatic trade in Siberia. The lonely and

curiously shaped peninsula of Kamchátka, destined to be the scene of many a conflict with the natives, was discovered and taken possession of in 1697 by a peasant explorer named Vladímir Atlásov, but was not finally claimed as Russian territory until 1707.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Russian flag waved over all the territories of eastern Siberia. But the Russians were still excluded from the southern reaches of the Pacific, and the only obstacle to further progress in this direction was offered by the province of the Amur, which had been definitely reserved to China by the treaty of Nerchinsk, signed by Russia with China in 1689. The importance of the Amur region for Russia was little understood at St. Petersburg until Nicholái Muraviév came into imperial politics as governor-general of eastern Siberia (1847). Uniting the wisdom of the statesman with the skill of the diplomatist, and something of the dash and enterprise of the explorer, this patriotic official early gave his attention to the maturing of a scheme for completing the conquest of northern Asia. Responsible for the victualing of certain Russian settlements in Chinese territory on the Sea of Ókhotsk and the Sea of Tatary, and needing for this purpose the waterways of the Amur, Muraviév boldly determined to

seize the coveted province in the name of Russia. He had the help, in his preparations, of Captain Nevélsky, commander of the brig Baikál, and this officer did not hesitate to make the first move by steaming up towards the mouth of the Amur, and taking possession, in the name of Russia, of any territory which attracted him. In 1851 Nevélsky, with the sanction of the Tsar, occupied the island of Sakhalín. In 1852 he founded first Petróvsk, afterwards Nikoláyevsk. It was on this occasion that Emperor Nicholas, being called upon to intervene in a dispute as to whether the settlements named should be maintained, made the remark, "Where the Russian flag has once been hoisted, it must not be lowered."

Muraviév made his first expedition into Amur territory in 1851–3. Other expeditions followed, carrying soldiers and colonists; and in 1858 the governor-general of eastern Siberia was able to lay the foundation of the town of Blagovéshchensk, as well as of Khabárovsk, at the mouth of the Ussuri. It was in this same year, moreover, that Muraviév reached the summit of his fame by obtaining from the Chinese, then humiliated by defeat in the war with France and England, the treaty of Aigun, signed in May, 1858, which surrendered all the territory on the left bank of the Amur to the Russians. Through the subsequent

Treaty of Pekin, of November 14, 1860, General Ignátiev obtained for Russia the cession of the maritime province of Manchuria, between the Ussuri River and the sea. By the operation of these agreements, Russia became possessor of the whole of northern Asia, and by special permission of China was enabled (1860) to occupy Vladivostók, and make of this her naval port in the far east. But in order to give its full political and strategical value to the movement of expansion begun three centuries before by Yermák, she still needed an adequate railway system, and this was finally decided upon in March, 1891, when Tsar Alexander III. formally authorized the construction of the Siberian railway in a rescript which was promulgated at Vladivostók, the eastern terminus of the line, on May 12 of the same year, by the Tsesarévich, now Nicholas II. of Russia, who laid the foundation stone. This railway, fast approaching completion, is estimated to cost nearly 350,000,000 rubles, and will involve the construction of some 4714 miles of line. It should be added that on the occasion of the German occupation of Kiao-chou, Russia obtained further concessions from China which enabled her (1897) to acquire Port Arthur and Ta-lien-wan, nearly five degrees south of Vladivostók, with the right to connect these ports by means of branch lines

with the Siberian railway system. In 1900 Russia also succeeded in obtaining, as a coaling station, the harbor of Masampho on the southwest coast of Korea.

Meanwhile the Russians had been expanding also in Central Asia, through lands which, for the popular imagination, added much of the mystery of fable to the peril of adventure. Stretching beyond the Caspian westward as far as Mongolia, extending from southern Siberia to the mountainous borders of Afghanistan, there lay an immense stretch of unexplored territory such as, in the time of Vladímir, must have dominated the expanding nucleus of Russian nationality like some great *officina gentium*, — some mighty simmering pot of races, — from which the warlike hordes of Asia were regularly poured forth upon the Slav country through the open land below the Urals. It was here that the Pechenégs worked their way eastward, here that the Pólovtsy harassed the Christians newly converted from Constantinople, and here also that the Tatars came through to devastate the country, to carry its people into captivity, and to hang about its limbs the chains of a serfdom which for over two centuries brought its intellectual life to a standstill. Only when the Russians had gained strength enough to beat back the invaders, and to take possession of their strongholds in

Europe, could the movement of expansion into Central Asia properly begin. In the unauthorized raids which naturally preceded this movement, it was the Cossacks of the Ural who were the first to take the initiative. The earliest official relations with Central Asia seem to have been opened in 1700, when the Khan of Khiva petitioned to be taken under the protection of Peter the Great. No response was given by the Tsar, but in 1715 he sent Prince Bekóvich-Cherkassky to explore the lower reaches of the Sir Darya for gold, as well as to make investigations in connection with the scheme for turning the course of the Oxus so that it might flow once more into the Caspian. An expedition was the result of Bekóvich's favorable report, but owing to the treachery of the new ruler of Khiva, the Russians were massacred to a man. For a while the agents of the Tsar turned their attention to other parts of Central Asian territory. Thus Omsk and the middle course of the Irtish became Russian in 1716–19. In 1731 the Kirghíz of the Middle Horde surrendered their territory to Anna Ivánovna, and thus gave Russia her first foothold in lands claimed by the khanates of Khiva and Bukharâ. The settlement of Orenburg, in 1743, provided at once a convenient rendezvous for the caravan trade, and a starting point for military expeditions. In 1803 the Tsar received the sub-

mission of the tribes of the Mangishlak peninsula, on the eastern shores of the Caspian; in 1832 the Little Horde was included within the government of Orenburg, the western Kirghíz being made subject to that of western Siberia. The time had now come for settling accounts with the Khivans, whose detention of Russian prisoners had grown into a formidable evil. The news of a first expedition against them led the khan to release his prisoners at the instance of an English officer; on hearing of a second, the khan submitted to Russia, and hastened, in 1842, to conclude a treaty of peace with the Tsar. The Russians meanwhile continued to strengthen their hold upon the Central Asian territory already occupied. Fort Peróvsky, for example, raised in 1853 over the ruins of the fortress of Ak-Muzhid, which had been held by the Khan of Khokand, gave them a dominating position on the Sir Darya, 280 miles from its mouth. In October, 1864, General Chernáyev took Chemkent, the capital of Turkestan, and shortly afterwards received the submission of Tashkent. In 1865 Tashkent was made the metropolis of the frontier district of Turkestan; in July, 1867, it became the headquarters of a governor-general appointed for that district.

The Russian advance in Central Asia having in the mean time begun to attract the attention of

the other European powers, it was deemed advisable to offer an explanation of the Russian policy. This was done by Prince Gortchakóff in a circular dated November 21, 1864. In this paper he dwelt on the dilemma in which civilized states in contact with wandering tribes found themselves. Control was necessary over such people, but the tribes brought into subjection became in turn the victims of similar aggression on the part of more remote tribes. Thus the process had to be repeated until the dominating power came into direct contact with one which afforded reasonable guarantees that it could maintain order within its own territory. It was while the Russians were drawing comfort from such reasoning as this that the three great states of Central Asia which had thus far succeeded in maintaining their independence — the khanates of Bukharâ, Khiva, and Khokand — were preparing to make a final stand against the invader. Alarmed at the victorious advance of the Russians, they did not hesitate to make common cause with one another. But their resistance was unavailing. General Romanóvsky first signally defeated them on May 20, 1866, when a Bukharan force of 5000 infantry and 35,000 mounted troops were compelled to make a disorderly retreat. In October of the same year the border strongholds of Ura-tepe and

Jizak were captured; the seizure of Yani Kurgan, in the beginning of 1867, gave to Russia the control of the Sir Darya basin. On May 12, 1868, the conjoined forces of Bukhará and Khiva, to the number of 40,000, were defeated by the troops under General Kaufmann, and the fall of Samarkand on the following day led, on June 18, 1868, to the cession by treaty of that city, of the Katta Kurgan, and the Valley of the Zerafshan.

The reduction of Khiva was the necessity now forced upon the Russians, not only by the depredations of Khivan robbers, but also by the attitude of the khan himself, who had begun to levy taxes on tribes under Russian influence, and had threatened to proclaim a holy war. In 1873 three columns moved against the city, one commanded by General Kaufmann, of 5500 men and eighteen guns; the other under Colonel Markósov, of 3000 troops; and the third in charge of General Verévkin. Each column had a different starting point and a particular route of its own, but all were to meet at Khiva. General Verévkin was the first to reach his destination, and it was his attack upon the city, on May 9, which placed it at the disposal of the Russians. General Kaufmann came up later, entering Khiva on June 10, 1873. Not content with the passive part which he and his officers were thus compelled to play in the affair,

Kaufmann promptly planned a campaign against the Turkoman Yomuds, who were unfortunate enough to have settlements on Khivan territory. Under the pretext of punishing them for neglect to pay in money the sum of 310,000 rubles within twelve days, he ordered his lieutenant Golovachév to exterminate the tribe, sparing neither sex nor age. This order was faithfully carried out, and for five days the Khiva oasis resounded with the shrieks of the victims. The treaty which followed this massacre, dated October 10, 1873, transferred to Russia all Khivan territory to the right of the river Oxus. Yet at an interview in London with Earl Granville in January, 1873, nine months previously, Count Schouváloff, besides disclaiming, on behalf of his imperial master, Alexander II., any intention on the part of Russia to annex territory in Central Asia, had described the sole object of the expedition then about to be dispatched to Khiva as being "to punish acts of brigandage, to recover fifty Russian prisoners, and to teach the khan that such conduct on his part could not be continued with impunity." The Count added, moreover, that positive orders had been given not to annex Khiva. And when, two years later, civil war in Khokand gave a new pretext for interference in the affairs of the khanates, the Russians again interposed in behalf of

order. The Khokandian army made its last stand at Makhram, and was there early in 1875 literally annihilated. It took about a year to effect the "subjugation" of the disturbed territory; and then, in March, 1876, the khanate of Khokand was by proclamation annexed to the Russian empire under the name of Fergana, with General Skóbelev as its governor.

For the complete domination of Central Asia the Russians now needed only the possession of the Turkoman territory. This was a triangular piece of land, some 240,000 square miles in extent, connecting the Caspian with the course of the Amu Dariya. Here dwelt, in the oases of Merv and Akkhal, with Merv as their chief city, the Tekké branch of the Turkomans, a nomadic, warlike race, originally of Turkic stock, which had inhabited the Altai Mountains and the upper regions of the Yeniséi and the Irtish rivers. Though in frequent collision with the Persian authorities, the Tekkés had thus far evaded all attempts to subjugate or civilize them. Organized for robbery, emboldened by success, the terror of the individual caravan and the scourge of Central Asian commerce, these picturesque marauders were none the less marked out for removal by the forces that were transforming the civilization of southern Asia. The first blow against their domination

was struck with the formation of the new province or military district of Transcaspia, including all the territory between the Caspian and the Aral seas, with General Lomákin as its governor, and headquarters at Krasnovódsk. In the early part of 1877 Lomákin occupied the Tekké fortress of Kizil Arvat, 200 miles from Krasnovódsk, and in 1879 made his first and last attempt to subjugate the enemy, being forced with his troops into ignominious retreat from the Tekké stronghold at Geok-Tepe by some 20,000 defenders turned into demons by the butchery of their women. Taking the place of the incompetent and superseded Lomákin, General Skóbelev marched on Geok-Tepe at the head of an attacking force of thoroughly disciplined troops, armed with breech-loaders, Hotchkiss machine guns, mitrailleuses, rocket apparatus, and a supply of petroleum shells. Laying down a line of railroad inland for about fifteen miles from the Caspian for transport purposes, and taking several Turkoman strongholds on the way, Skóbelev found himself on January 1, 1881, before Danghil-Tepe,[1] — an inclosure forming an irregular parallelogram about a mile in area, surrounded by a thick mud wall, and occupied by about 30,000 Tekkés, with whom were some 7000

[1] Originally the name of a mound at the northwest angle of the fortification. Situated in the district of Geok-Tepe.

women and children. The work of storming the fortification began at once. On January 24, after a siege which lasted more than three weeks, during which the assaulting party was constantly interrupted in its work by the desperate sallies of the defenders, who attacked the soldiers in the trenches, the Russians succeeded in effecting an entrance, drove the Tekkés from their stronghold, and forced them into flight across the plain beyond. The struggle cost the Russians 1200 men in killed and wounded; the loss of the Tekkés has been stated as 9000 out of a total of 30,000.[1] In asking for recruits, Skóbelev had entreated his superiors to send him only soldiers who would have no opinion of their own in regard to the "hard necessities of war," and officers "whose sole idea is their duty, and who do not entertain visionary sentiments." When the Tekkés had begun their headlong retreat, Skóbelev ordered a pursuit, instructing the troops to give no quarter. In obedience to this order, the fugitives — men, women, and children — were hacked by the pursuing column for a distance of nearly twelve miles. This victory has been described as "not a rout, but a massacre; not a defeat, but an extirpation;" yet it was a victory over a people whom Skóbelev himself, in his pro-

[1] According to the "minimized" estimates of General Kuropatkin.

clamation to the troops before the battle, declared to be "full of honor and courage." And after the defeat of the Tekkés, the Russians were allowed to loot for four days, and to possess themselves of property worth more than half a million sterling.

Two months later news came of the assassination of Alexander II., and Skóbelev was recalled to St. Petersburg. The Russian policy in Central Asia rested for a time, in accordance with the instructions of the new Tsar; but it was taken up again, and in January, 1884, through diplomacy, aided by a demonstration in force, the conquest of the Turkoman territory was rendered practically complete by the acquisition of Merv and the Merv oasis. The Yolatan oasis, thirty-six miles south of Merv, and the territory of the eastern Giaour and Sarakhs tribes, were soon afterwards surrendered to Russia. The questions relating to the possession of the other territory bordering on Persia and northern Afghanistan, after occasioning disquietude in England, on account of its strategic importance, were finally left to the decision of a Joint Boundary Commission which met at St. Petersburg in April, 1887, General Sir Peter Lumsden being the English representative, and General Zelenóy the Russian commissioner. By this decision Russia obtained the right bank of the Hari-Rud as far as Zu-l-Fikar Pass and the valleys

of the Badghis south of and including the Panjdih oasis, and was thus entitled to advance the southern boundaries of her Asiatic possessions to a point within fifty-three miles of Herat in a straight line. The work of demarcating the spheres of English and Russian influence on the Pamirs was performed in August, 1895, by the English and Russian representatives, the three great Asiatic empires being found to meet "amidst a solitary wilderness, 20,000 feet above sea level, absolutely inaccessible to man, and within the ken of no living creature except the Pamir eagles." Skóbelev's provisional line of railroad has since been carried by successive stages into the very heart of Central Asia. With a western terminus at Krasnovódsk, it now passes through Samarkand as far as Tashkent, and has branch lines extending to Andijan in the province of Fergana, and southward (Murghab River branch) from Merv to Kushk, which is within five miles of the Afghan frontier. The latter branch has been constructed for strategic as well as commercial purposes, and would be used with effect should the English ever jeopardize Russian interests in Central Asia by the occupation of Herat.[1]

This brief sketch of the Russian eastward movement reveals facts which are without precedent in

[1] See statement of Baron Jomini to Lord Dufferin in 1879.

the history of national expansion. It took the Americans two centuries to reach the Pacific from their settlements in the east; the Russians traversed the whole northern course of the Asiatic continent in about seventy years. The Asiatic possessions of Russia amount to 6,564,700 square miles, and this enormous stretch of territory, with its population of 18,915,335, including 101 distinct non-Slav races, has been added to European Russia in the course of about three centuries. The acquirement of most of the Siberian territory was achieved by a process of exploration alternating with settlement, in which successful diplomacy counted for much, and the pioneers had the aid at critical moments of small bodies of soldiery. The native peoples occasionally offered the most determined resistance; the attitude towards Russian advance shown by the Chinese, who also had imperial interests at stake, was throughout that of an unprogressive and unenterprising race which contributed by its own apathy something of the justification needed for its displacement. In more southern latitudes the Russian movement, especially in its modern stages, took the form of a military conquest of peoples who were either plunderers by profession or constant disturbers of the general welfare. The northern advance through Siberia, again, may fairly be regarded as

a continuation of the movement which carried the earlier Russian colonizers from Kiev and Moscow as far as the Urals ; in the expansion through Central Asia we are entitled to see the migratory tendencies of the Russian people developed into a state policy. The result of the whole movement north and south has been to enormously increase the official responsibilities of the Russian government, to say nothing of the involved imposition of new burdens upon the people.

The fact that the colonization described has been entirely over land carries with it the disadvantage of enforced defense and administration of the territory acquired. Not only has Russia been unable to anticipate the prospect of independence for her many colonies: she has been obliged to administer them from a capital on the western verge of a territory whose furthermost eastern boundary is reached only at an interval of thousands of miles from St. Petersburg. It must also be borne in mind that throughout the period of her colonizing activity, Russia has been devoting to the acquirement of territory which her overflow population will not need for hundreds of years yet to come, energies which a smaller country would have spent in internal development, especially in political progress. The actual use made of her military forces has been shown, especially in the

Central Asian campaigns, to depend almost as much upon the caprice of leaders in the field as upon the nature of a policy dictated from St. Petersburg. Yet while her severity in overcoming resistance is unexampled, she loses no time in cultivating good relations with the foe she has vanquished ; certainly her tolerance of his religious faith and of his semi-barbaric customs goes far to make him forget the price which his race has paid for their resistance. But beyond this there is little to be said. Russia has not yet begun to assimilate the Asiatic peoples who acknowledge her sway. While they have gained — and gained greatly — in the order and other material advantages she introduces, they continue to be Asiatics ; and any coherence with Russia which they have thus far acquired is the solidarity which results, not from common intellectual habits and social structure, but from impressed military rule. It is none the less fortunate that an eastward movement undertaken for private advantage should have done so much to promote general interests, and that Russia, herself somewhat of the Orient, and therefore specially qualified, should have been the first to make a serious beginning in the transformation of Asia, a task now raised by recent events in China to the dignity of a world problem.

XI

SIBERIA AND THE EXILE SYSTEM

An account of Russia which made no mention of the exile system would be inadequate. The very word "Siberia" has deeply impressed itself upon the popular imagination. For the people of Russia it is associated with some of the saddest aspects of their national life; for the world in general, especially for literature, it has become a synonym for the suppression of free thought and the punishment, not only of political, but also of religious aspirations. Yet it is only in relation to the exile system, and to the practice of banishing men and women to the extreme northern areas of the Asian continent, that Siberia is correctly described as a forbidding waste, where the exile must drag out the brief day of his monotonous existence either in the utter absence of human companionship, other than that of his fellow exiles, or in regions within the arctic circle inhabited only by the aborigine nomads of the far north. In its southern areas, Siberia is a country of delightful climate, of exceedingly fertile soil, as well as of resources,

mineral and agricultural, which have scarcely yet been touched. With great and numerous waterways traversing it in all directions, and with its growing lines of railway, the most important of which — that connecting Europe with the Chinese coast — is now approaching completion, Asiatic Russia promises to play a part in the world's trade the magnitude of which is yet far from being fully realized. The enormous extent of the country — into which, by the way, the whole of the United States and the non-Russian countries of Europe could be placed, along with another territory as large as France, without using up the available space — will make of Siberia, for centuries to come, a more than ample as well as appropriate outlet for the surplus populations of European Russia.

The first mention of this vast continent in connection with the Russian punitive system dates as far back as the reign of Alexéi Mikháilovich. Exile to portions of it for colonizing purposes is mentioned as early as 1582, and account is given of the punitive banishment of 7400 persons in 1622. But we do not get definite statements until the eighteenth century is reached. The first convoy of exiled persons was forwarded to the peninsula of Kamchátka in 1709, two years after the region had become Russian territory. That con-

voy originally contained some 14,000 persons, mainly prisoners of war taken by Peter the Great in his campaign against the Swedes; but owing to the hardships met with, a large number of the party died before reaching their destination. The exile system which thus had its beginnings in the necessities of war was soon utilized for the purposes of civil administration. In 1762 the owners of serfs in European Russia, the village communes, as well as individual landowners, were by formal ukaz permitted to send their troublesome slaves into northern Asia. The opening of the silver mines of Siberia in the eighteenth century produced a demand for labor which the authorities proceeded to satisfy by transferring thither a large number of prisoners who had not yet served out their sentences in the jails of European Russia. As the Russian punitive system developed, moreover, it became the custom to banish not only persons accused of the graver crimes, but also men and women charged with trivial offenses, until finally Siberia came to be regarded as a convenient destination for all who, for one reason or another, on one pretext or another, had become obnoxious to the authorities. The use of the territory as a place of banishment for political offenders began with the earliest manifestations of political conspiracy in Russia, and it is the treatment of such offenders

— the circumstances of their arrest, transfer, and punishment, rather than the custom of banishment for ordinary crimes — which has attracted the attention of the world to what has become so widely known as "Siberian exile."

For a century or more the method of dealing with convicts who had been sentenced to Siberia was crude in the extreme. No pains seem to have been taken to preserve the identity of the prisoners, or to make it certain that an accused person would serve out the sentence imposed by a court or fixed administratively by the Minister of the Interior. Prisoners could exchange names and sentences at will; men convicted of serious crimes were sometimes released after a few months' detention, while offenders whose delinquency had been trivial were kept for years at hard labor in the mines. The journey to Siberia had to be performed, moreover, on foot; the members of the marching party wore leg fetters, and were accompanied by guards under orders to punish serious insubordination or the effort to escape with death. The exiles usually set out from some large city of European Russia, such as Moscow; passing over the Urals, and halting only at the famous boundary post, the farewell scenes at which have been so vividly depicted by the Polish painter Alexander Sochaczewski, they gradually proceeded by successive stages along the

roads leading to Siberia. Thrown upon the public for subsistence, the party literally begged its way from one provincial city to another, the first indication of its approach being the *milosérdnaya*, or "exiles' begging song," in which the convicts appealed for assistance: —

> For the sake of Christ,
> Have pity on us, O our fathers!
> Don't forget the unwilling travelers —
> Don't forget the long imprisoned!
> Feed us, O our fathers, help us!
> Feed us, help the poor and needy!

The systematization and improvement of Siberian exile seem to have begun in 1754 in the reign of Elizabeth, a year after that monarch, having abolished capital punishment in her dominions, substituted therefor exile to the more northern parts of Asiatic Russia. Towards the end of the eighteenth century Paul expended 100,000 rubles for the erection of convict settlements for 10,000 persons in the Zabaikál. In 1811 an armed guard was organized to accompany parties of exiles to Siberia, and the convicts were thenceforward provided with documents showing their identity; in 1822 new regulations suggested by the census of 1819 were introduced, and these underwent further improvement in 1840, when Siberian exile was brought into general harmony

with the penal code of the empire. The system of *étape*, or exile houses, erected at intervals along the principal roads, went into effect in the year 1817. In 1823 the existing bureau of exile administration was established at Tobólsk, — an institution which, since removed to Tiumén, there keeps a record of all convicts exiled, besides exercising a supervision over their transportation and distribution through Siberia.

In its modern form, as described by Mr. Kennan and others, the system takes cognizance of four classes of exiles. There are first the "hard-labor" convicts — men and women punished for the graver crimes, including political offenses — who, in addition to exile, which is for life, lose all their civil rights. Next come the "penal colonists," offenders whose crimes, though less serious, suffice to deprive them of civil rights. The third class is constituted of the simple exiles, who do not lose all their civil rights by banishment; while the fourth is made up of the women and children who voluntarily follow their relatives into exile. The convicts of the first two classes go to Siberia in fetters, with one side of the head shaved, and remain there for life; the members of the third class are at liberty, on the expiration of their term of banishment, to return to European Russia. They include persons banished by the village

communes, or by order of the Minister of the Interior, or by the sentence of a court, as well as persons who have lost their passports, or vagrants who refuse to give their real names.

Three centuries were allowed to elapse before records of the Siberian system began to be preserved. Between 1807 and 1813 the deportations numbered 2000 yearly; between 1814 and 1847 they averaged from 3000 to 8000; while from 1853 to 1863 the average number was 10,000. In 1876 there were 19,000 exiles in Siberia; in 1882 the number had fallen to 16,000. Between 1823 and 1887, as recorded by the Exile Bureau of Tobólsk, no fewer than 772,979 persons were transported to the Asiatic possessions of Russia. In 1896, as shown by the report of the Russian prison administration, 9628 men and 540 women were banished to Siberia, while 744 men and 871 women voluntarily followed their relatives into exile. In the same year, for transportation to Siberia, 17,013 prisoners reached the prison of Tiumén, whence they were distributed to different parts of the north Asiatic continent. The most recent reports from the island of Sakhalín show that on January 1, 1896, it contained a population of 6703 hard-labor convicts and 8433 released convicts and exiles, in addition to 2838 free settlers and 1323 women who, with about 4768

children, had voluntarily followed their husbands into exile. The number of voluntary exiles — mainly wives and children — reached 54,900 between the years 1823 and 1880; in 1876, 3000 women thus shared the fate of their husbands; in the year 1885, as stated by Mr. Kennan, 5536 wives and children, out of a total of 15,766, were voluntary exiles. According to such authorities as Maksímov and Yádrintsev, the total number of persons exiled to Siberia between 1754 and 1899 was 1,450,000.

It is also to be noted that a certain proportion of the persons exiled to Siberia in the first and second classes — and of these probably one per cent are political offenders — are thus punished not by the sentence of a court, but by "administrative process," as it is called in Russia — in other words, by the simple order of the Minister of the Interior. Between 1827 and 1846, 79,909 persons were exiled to Siberia without preliminary trial. The report of a prison commission appointed by Alexander II. in the seventies showed that an average of 45.6 per cent of all the exiles then in Siberia had been sentenced by a court, while 54.4 per cent had been exiled by administrative process; the number of administrative exiles between 1867 and 1876 was 78,686. According to a later report, the political offenders banished

by simple order from 1879 to 1884 numbered 749, showing a rate of about 125 each year. The number of persons administratively exiled in 1896 was 1699. At the present time about 6000 persons are banished every year without trial, and are followed into exile by about 4000 wives and children.[1]

The evils of the Siberian system begin with the crowding of the exiles into the prisons of European Russia in such cities as Moscow, Nizhny-Nóvgorod, Kazán, and Perm. There is next the injury the convicts suffer during the process of their transportation from Europe to their destination in Asia. In recent years it has been possible to lessen the hardships of transportation, and this has been done by the substitution for the journey on foot of railway trains through portions of the land route, and of barges where rivers facilitate the journey. Thus convicts may travel from Kazán to Tiumén either by rail or water. Having journeyed by steamer from Nizhny-Nóvgorod to Perm, a distance of nearly a thousand miles, they go by rail over the Urals to Ekaterinburg and Tiumén. Here they remain for two weeks or more in the Tiumén forwarding prison, and are then transported in convict barges via the rivers Irtish and Ob, as far as Tomsk, for distribution thence on

[1] See article on "The Siberian Exile System" in *Rússkoe Bogátstvo* for April, 1900.

foot to their various destinations. The exiles thus escape, for parts of the route, the former hardships of the marching party, as well as the filth and disease of the *étape* house; yet the immunity is more than made up to them by their experiences in the convict barge, with its stifling atmosphere and unsanitary conditions, and in the overcrowded, germ-laden forwarding prison; while those who go beyond Tomsk have still to run the gauntlet of the *étape* system for hundreds of miles into the forbidding regions of eastern Siberia.

The first Siberian prison encountered by the exiles who cross the Urals and proceed along the route described above is the forwarding prison in Tiumén, through which pass all persons banished to Asiatic Russia. The condition of this prison, which has since undergone but little improvement, may be gathered from the fact that in the years between 1876 and 1886 inclusive, the inmates were dying at the rate of 300 a year, the death rate varying from 23.7 per cent in 1882 to 44.1 in 1879. Visiting it in 1885, Mr. Kennan found 1800 people crowded into a building made to hold only 800. Some of the cells contained more than four times the number they were built to receive. The prisoners slept at night head to head on "the foul, muddy floors" in unventilated wards whose air "had apparently been respired over and over

again until it did not contain an atom of oxygen; it was laden with fever germs from the unventilated hospital wards, fetid odors from diseased human lungs and unclean human bodies, and the stench arising from unemptied excrement buckets at the ends of the corridors." "It was," says Mr. Kennan, "like trying to breathe in an underground hospital drain."

What next becomes of the convicts who pass alive through the Tiumén forwarding prison? They are put on board barges for transportation to Tomsk. At the beginning of its journey, Mr. Kennan found one of these vessels, after fumigation, in good condition for its work, but when it had discharged its human load, the barge suggested to him "a recently vacated wild beast cage in a menagerie. It was no more dirty," he says, "than might have been expected; but its atmosphere was heavy with a strong animal odor; its floors were covered with dried mud, into which had been trodden refuse scraps of food; its *nari*, or sleeping benches, were black and greasy, and strewn with bits of dirty paper; and in the gray light of a cloudy day its dark *kameras*, with their small grated portholes, muddy floors, and polluted ammoniacal atmosphere, chilled and depressed me with suggestions of human misery." Since this description was written, there has been a gradual

improvement in the condition of the barges, but the records remain, and they show that from 1870 to 1884 inclusive, out of 148,489 carried between Tiumén and Tomsk 7066 were taken sick and 569 died.

But now comes the Dantean hell of the forwarding prison at Tomsk. When Mr. Kennan inspected it in 1885, it contained over 3000 prisoners, though designed to hold only 1400. One *kamera* he entered was polluted to the last degree by over-respiration, and the men had to lie down in the mud and filth which, in rainy weather, the prisoners brought in on their shoes. The *balagány*, or family *kamery*, were "literally packed with hundreds of weary-eyed men, haggard women, and wailing children, sitting or lying in all conceivable attitudes upon two long lines of rough plank sleeping benches," forming "a chaos of disorder and misery" in which, amid "air insufferably fetid," "hundreds of human beings, packed so closely together that they could not move without touching one another, were trying to exist, and to perform the necessary duties of life." The cases of sickness for the year in this prison numbered 2400, and there were 450 patients in the prison hospital at one time, with beds for only 150.

From Tomsk the exiles are distributed to their destinations. For this purpose, marching parties,

300 to 400 in each, made up every week, travel from Tomsk to Irkútsk, a distance of 1040 miles, and spend about three months on the road. In summer the convicts are dressed in gray-cloth suits, including a long overcoat in the back of which is stitched a diamond of black or yellow, and have ankle-guards to prevent the leg fetters from chafing. The common and the political offenders are not distinguished, save in the matter of government allowance and method of transportation; the ordinary convicts march on foot, and receive five cents a day for their subsistence; the politicals who are also nobles, or belong to the privileged classes, are carried in carts, and receive seven and a half cents a day. On the march, the ordinary convicts take the lead; closely following them come vehicles filled with the sick and infirm of the party; to these succeed the "politicals" also in carts; then wagons with baggage in gray linen bags, the rear-guard of soldiers, and finally the chief officer of the convoy.

The road traveled is called the *étape* road, from the fact that at intervals of from twenty-five to forty miles there are exile station houses, where the prisoners rest, and where a military guard kept there for the purpose relieves the guard of the arriving party. Midway between the *étape* houses are *polu-étapes*, or halfway houses, so arranged with

reference to the *étape* houses that a temporary place of rest and shelter is provided every night for the party on the march, which is also allowed twenty-four hours rest every third day on its arrival at the *étape* house proper. The *étapes* and *polu-étapes* are alike inadequate for the reception of the parties which are constantly crowded into them; they have been described by General Anuchin, the governor general of eastern Siberia, in his report to the Tsar, as "particularly bad"—as "tumble-down buildings in bad sanitary condition, cold in winter, saturated with miasma, and offering very little security against escapes." Much disorder and demoralization used to result from the practice of sending unmarried men and unmarried women with the marching parties of convicts accompanied by their wives and children. Since 1883 an effort has been made to remove this source of evil by forwarding unmarried male prisoners in separate convoys, and allowing unmarried women to travel in the family parties. But the demoralization has not altogether ceased; and the stories of political exiles, as well as of exiled women, —many of whom are banished merely for the offense of having lost their passports [1] — show that it

[1] A fact emphasized by Tolstóy in his latest story, *Resurrection*, which contains a sympathetic description of a party of "politicals" exiled to Siberia.

frequently has its source in the military convoy. Meanwhile, the hardships of the road itself affect both sexes impartially. The clothes provided by the government give no sufficient protection against inclemencies of weather. The boots of the prisoners, expected to last for six weeks, are of such poor quality, owing to official fraud, that they often become worthless in a couple of days, and the loser has to continue his march barefooted through "mud whose temperature is little above freezing point." Many of the convicts, drenched to the skin by rain, become sick, and linger for months in the *étape* hospitals without proper medical care. In 1883 seventy exiles died during a journey of twenty-one days between Tomsk and Achinsk. The report for 1885, made by Mr. Galkin Wrasskóy, chief of the prison administration, showed that the lazarets between Achinsk and Irkútsk were without nurses, hospital linen, beds, bedding, and dishes for food, and provided no separation according to age, sex, or nature of disease.

The destination of the hard-labor convicts who thus set out for Tomsk in the marching parties is to a large extent the territory beyond Lake Baikál, and particularly the mining settlements known respectively by the names of Karà and Nerchinsk. The Silver Mines of Nerchinsk is the title given to an extensive district bordering on the rivers

Shilka and Argun. Since 1863, when many Polish conspirators were banished to this region, the mines have been recruited from the ordinary convict populations of European Russia; and though once notorious in Siberian exile literature, they have come to attract attention less on account of hardship in the mines than by reason of unsanitary conditions in the adjoining prisons. The chief modern interest in the Siberian mines centres in the region of Karâ, — a name given to a district which contains mines, prisons, and convict settlements. The mines consist of a number of gold placers situated at intervals along the banks of the Karâ River, and are worked — for the benefit of the Tsar, who regards their yield as his private property — by some 2000 convicts. Half of these, at the time of Mr. Kennan's visit, were kept in the prisons; the rest lived in barracks, or occupied cabins of their own in the "open." The convict arriving at Karâ is at first subjected to rigid discipline. The prison is his home, and he is marched from it each day under guard; to it, after his work in the mines, he marches every night. But by good conduct, he may acquire the right to release from the prison into what is called the "free command." He still remains a prisoner, but he can now either live in barracks with other convicts, or reside with his family in a separate cabin; he is

free, moreover, to dispose of his leisure time. Continuing to give satisfaction to the authorities, he is finally permitted to leave the mines altogether, and to settle in some part of Siberia as a "forced colonist," with the privilege of living like a farmer and cultivating a patch of land.

The evils of convict life at Karâ, as at Nerchinsk, seem to be less referable to the actual work exacted at the mines than due to the condition of the prisons, the *kamery* of which, being usually overcrowded, abound in disease germs, and, not to speak of personal discomfort, cause a high rate of sickness and death among the occupants. Much of the interest in Karâ has been aroused by the personal history of many of the political offenders who have been sent thither as well as by the treatment accorded to them at the hands of prison officials. It is here that the punishment of chaining men to the wheelbarrows which they use in their work has been frequently inflicted; here where both men and women have been flogged for insubordination, in some cases so severely that the punishment has been followed in a short time by death; here also where the "politicals" have joined in "hunger strikes" as the only means left them of protest against the cruelties of the prison authorities; and here that political offenders have gone mad,

or committed suicide, as a means of avoiding insanity.

The lot of persons sent into ordinary banishment, not involving a period of detention in prison, is much more bearable; yet even upon these serious grievances are sometimes inflicted. Such convicts, being assigned to "definite places of residence," there come under that peculiar form of police surveillance which is one of the chief features of the Russian administrative process. The place of exile differs according to the gravity of the alleged offence, or the purpose of the Minister of the Interior. It may be some large city of Siberia, where civilized society exists, such as Semipalátinsk, Tomsk, or even Irkútsk; or it may be some remote village or settlement within the arctic circle, where there is no society save that of the nomads. On the exile arriving at his destination he comes under rules of exile and police surveillance which expressly state that these are not punishments for crimes already committed, but measures of precaution to prevent crimes which the evil-minded may have in contemplation. The code confines the exile within certain limits; it compels him to report regularly to the police; it places his correspondence under their control, and provides that officers may visit his residence whenever it may be deemed necessary. To the dif-

ficulty of finding lodgings under such circumstances is added the problem of earning a living. The allowance made by the government — six rubles, or three dollars a month — is too small to enable him to subsist; he finds himself therefore compelled to seek some means of adding to his income. But here the interfering code imposes so many limitations upon his activity — forbidding to him everything in the nature of professional employment — that the political exile, always an educated man, is usually doomed — save in the rare cases in which the regulations are relaxed in his behalf by a humane official — either to starve or to eke out his living by resort to some humiliating form of labor.

Many distinguished men, either by work in the mines or by ordinary banishment, have expiated their offences against the Russian government by exile to Siberia. One of the earliest of them was Kryzhánich, the publicist, who was exiled to Tobólsk in 1661, and served out a sentence of sixteen years. At the end of the eighteenth century the government of Catherine the Great banished Radíshchev, the earliest of the Russian political reformers, for a term of ten years. The first considerable batch of political offenders were exiled to Siberia as a result of the insurrection of the "Decembrists" in 1825. Some thirty of them,

including Trubetskóy, the nominal leader, Wolkhónsky, Muraviév, and others, lived for a time at Chita in two log houses which still exist; one of them, strangely enough, has been used up to recent times as a rendezvous for modern political exiles banished to this part of Siberia. The life of the thirty, and of those who, at first confined on the island of Aland, and in the fortress of Schlüsselburg, subsequently joined them on the completion of a new prison for which they themselves had dug the foundations, has been described by Baron Rosen, one of the number, in his "Russian Conspirators in Siberia." It was in connection with the exile of the "Decembrists" that the custom of permitting women to follow their husbands into banishment was set up, though the honor of initiating it belongs to Catherine, the wife of Trubetskóy, as well as, in a less degree, to the Princess Maria Wolkhónsky. The heroism displayed by these two women in the course of their long and painful journey to the mines has been immortalized by Nekrásov in his poem, "Russian Women."

Among the more recent cases of banishment which have attracted world-wide attention is that of the famous novelist Dostoyévsky. According to the story of a fellow prisoner, one Rozhnóvsky, who published his narrative in the Tiflis "Kav-

kaz," Dostoyévsky was twice flogged by the prison authorities at Omsk. On the first occasion he was punished for having complained, on behalf of other prisoners, of a lump of filth found in their soup. The second time his offence was that of persisting, in defiance of an officer's orders to the contrary, in saving a fellow prisoner from drowning. The novelist was brutally beaten on both occasions; after the second flogging he had to be removed to the hospital, emerging from it only to receive from the other convicts, who regarded him as dead, the epithet of "deceased." Another literary man punished for his writings was Nicholái Gavrílovich Chernishévsky, concerning whom the report was spread that he had been chained to the walls of a mine and flogged. Chernishévsky was exiled in 1864 on account of articles published by him in the "Contemporary," among them being a criticism of John Stuart Mill's work on "Political Economy." His original sentence of fourteen years' hard labor in the mines was commuted to seven, with subsequent exile for life. From 1864 to 1871 Chernishévsky lived at a station in the Zabaikál province of eastern Siberia as a hard-labor convict. On the expiration of the hard-labor period in 1871, he was formally named a "penal colonist," the town of Viluisk being designated as his place of residence.

He remained there till 1883, when the government permitted him to return to European Russia. He was seen at Astrakhan in that year by the writer, to whom he communicated some of his experiences in exile. During his stay at Viluisk, the government allowed him 200 rubles a year for his subsistence — a sum ample, having regard to the cost of living in that part of Siberia. Speaking on the subject of his treatment by the authorities, Chernishévsky denied that he had ever been in the mines, but admitted that he was put in chains — "perhaps a week." "But that," he continued, "was done by some agents of the government who had misunderstood my real relations with the authorities. When the government came to hear of it, they gave orders that it should not be repeated. That episode excepted, I was always treated by the agents of the government as respectfully as any man living could desire. My treatment was throughout not that of a convict, but that of a prisoner of war. The hard labor of which I have spoken was for me, as well as for many of the Russian and Polish political exiles among whom my lot was cast, a name only — it existed on paper, but had no reality."

As a set-off against testimonies of this sort — given by a man completely in the power of the government whose actions he seems to condone —

may be cited the statements of more humble victims of the Siberian system, even if, for obvious reasons, they do not always come to us with the name of the writer attached. "When our marching party left Tomsk," writes an exile banished in 1882 for "political untrustworthiness," "a snowstorm began. The roads were in a dreadful condition. Many of the party, chiefly women, fainted away or went into hysterics; several children died in their mothers' laps from the cold. In the *étape* station it was almost impossible to breathe. The sleeping planks were dirty, and the walls covered with vermin. . . . For weeks we traveled through all sorts of privations and fatigues, several falling ill, and others dying on the way. The wife of the banished doctor Byely, who was going to join her husband, went mad in consequence of the hardships and the inhuman treatment of the soldiers." Another exile, kept in the Yakútsk prison about the same time, wrote: "We live literally in the dark, and have only from one and a half to two hours of light in which to eat. We have no bread, but only fish. My ailment is getting worse. I have no more hope of ever seeing the sun again. We work from six in the morning till eight in the evening, in ice-cold water, which frequently rises up to our knees. When we reach our cells at night we are utterly

exhausted. . . . We need everything — books, linen, shoes, and money. Our torments are frightful; if we could only have an hour in the open air we should be satisfied." A few lines may be added from the mines at Karâ: "A few days ago the soldiers beat Miss Armfeld with the butt ends of their muskets for insubordination. . . . Rods and knuts come often into use here. . . . Zhutin died the other day in chains bound to the wall. Kolenkin is dying of his wounds, which are being torn open by his fetters. Semenovsky has shot himself; Rudin has poisoned himself with matches. We have to carry our fetters not only during working hours, but also in our cells. . . . So we live, on a diet of black bread, in a cold, damp, and suffocating atmosphere, continually threatened with bayonets and the butt ends of muskets, and only kept alive by a single hope — that of being able to return home and see once again those near and dear to us." [1]

In recent years various circumstances have contributed to lessen the faith of the Russian government in the Siberian exile system. One of these is the increasing cost at which it has had to be

[1] First published in the Russian revolutionary organs. For the fullest official confirmation of charges made by political exiles concerning the hardships of *étape* life and the condition of Siberian prisons, see many Russian magazine articles, also special articles and report in *The Russian Law Messenger*.

carried on, and the growing difficulty of adequately administering the system from so great a distance as St. Petersburg. The fraud and corruption inseparable from the system; the suffering resulting from official cruelty, as well as from the hardships of transportation; the excessive sick and death rate in the prisons and settlements; the demoralization incident to the non-separation of the sexes, to the constant escape of convicts, and to the practice of "man-hunting," degenerating into wholesale murder under the incitement of official rewards offered for their recapture — these accompaniments of the system have also had their weight with the Tsar and his advisers. A potent influence working for many decades against deportation to Siberia has been the opposition — expressed in petitions innumerable — of the Siberian populations to the continued settlement in their midst of ordinary convicts who, as "forced colonists," turned loose upon the community, commit as a rule two thirds of all the crimes for which Siberia is held responsible, and yet impose upon that same community the burden of their support. Mention must also be made of the new sensitiveness of the Russian administrative conscience to western opinion,[1] as well as of the con-

[1] An organ devoted to constitutional reform in Russia is regularly published in London, under the title of *Free Russia*, edited by Felix Volkhovsky and J. F. Green.

demnation which, with a few rare exceptions, the Siberian exile system has never ceased to receive, not only from Russian officials themselves, but also from travelers, philanthropists, prison reformers, literary men, and all others who have the welfare of the race at heart. If, therefore, Russian official announcements are to be depended upon, it must be regarded as a gain for humanity that the Tsar Nicholas II. has finally (May, 1900) sanctioned preliminary measures for the abolition of the system which in years past has added so much suffering to the preventable evil of the world.

XII

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

In the development thus briefly described, the Russians have had the aid, first of a distinctive form of speech which, though hampered by cumbrous inflections, is yet of remarkable richness and flexibility; and next, of a native literature in which the thought, the tendencies, and aspirations of the people have found fitting and worthy expression. The Russians of to-day have two forms of language in use, — Great-Russian, the speech of literature and of daily intercourse, and Ecclesiastical Slavonic, the language of the church books. The spoken tongue is the developed or modern form of the language originally used by the Russian Slavs — that is to say, of a dialect closely related to what we now know as Old Bulgarian. The Ecclesiastical Slavonic of the church liturgies, being practically identical with Old Bulgarian, represents the language first utilized for religious work among the Russian Slavs because of its close resemblance to their own tongue. The task of creating an alphabet which

could be used by the Greek priests in their ministrations to the Russians was undertaken by the Greek missionary Cyrillus, after whom the script was called Cyrillic. The construction of the alphabet — founded, as it was, mainly on the Greek letters, but also containing signs borrowed from Hebrew, Kopt, and Armenian — made it possible for translations of the Bible to be made into Old Bulgarian, and it was by means of these that the Scriptures were first made familiar in the Russian countries. Yet, as time went on, the spoken tongue diverged more and more from the language of the church books; and to-day the Ecclesiastical Slavonic, originally more or less intelligible to Russians, is so utterly foreign to them, having itself undergone certain alphabetic modifications, that it has to be acquired as a dead language even by the priests.

How, then, came the strange characters which are used to-day in the printing of Russian newspapers and books — characters which bear only slight resemblance to the much more complex forms of Ecclesiastical Slavonic, and which look for all the world like a mixture of small capitals alternating with "lower-case" letters reversed? They are largely the result of the many-sided activity of Peter the Great himself. Finding the letters of the Cyrillic alphabet much too cum-

brous for the purposes of the new culture, he determined (1708) to simplify them for civil use. Having himself designed the changes which he regarded as desirable, he had a sample set of letters constructed, and these he forwarded to Amsterdam with an order for regular fonts of type in the new style. Soon afterwards a Dutch artisan, Anton Demai by name, came to Russia with the sets of types arranged for by Peter. The experiment was successful enough, though its success was due, not to the autocratic power of the reformer, but rather to the fact that literature in Russia was not yet advanced and conservative enough to have stereotyped beyond recovery the alphabetic forms of the language in which it was written. The new type favored the "Europeanization" movement, since it represented an effort, by the rejection of some letters and the re-fashioning of others, to approximate Ecclesiastical Slavonic to the Roman or Latin alphabet of western Europe. The forms which Peter devised were destined to undergo still further slight modifications; yet they have remained to this day sufficiently strange and uncouth to constitute one of those obstacles to the complete assimilation of Russian with west-European culture which it was the aim of the reformer to remove.

The grammatical structure of Russian is another

feature of the language which makes it difficult of acquirement by foreigners accustomed only to the speech forms of the Germanic and Romance branches of Indo-European. Not only is the noun inflected, taking a special ending for nominative, genitive, dative, and accusative, — it has two additional cases, the instrumental, meaning "by" or "through," and the prepositional, signifying "to," "on," "upon," etc. The verb, though not burdened with many irregular forms, never fails to test the patience of the student with its multiplicity of "aspects;" before he can decide which of these to use, he must consider whether the action which he wishes to describe is of short duration, or habitual — whether it is "commencing," "continuing," "completed," or is undergoing repetition. Particles put before the verb, such as *za*, *raz*, *po*, *do*, *na*, *iz*, modify its meaning in a way perplexing to the beginner, who is in danger of committing the most ludicrous malapropisms. The pronouns in Russian have worked themselves free from the verb, yet they are frequently omitted, as in *Gotóv*, "I am ready," and *Noch*, "It was night." Russian resembles Greek, but still more German, in its power to form long lists of composites, not only by carrying a root idea through all the parts of speech, but by using prefixes, infixes, and postfixes. Thus there are composites formed with the word

slóvo, "word," such as *slovésnost*, "literature;" *slovár*, "dictionary;" *slóvny*, "from a dictionary;" *slovookhótlivost*, "verbiage;" *slovoudaréniye*, "prosody," etc.

In its general features, Russian is wanting in those verbal resemblances which, for example, give such aid to a speaker of English in his efforts to acquire languages like German or French. In a few terms descriptive of family life, or of objects common to it, likeness is carried through two or more of the Indo-European languages. Thus *mat*, "mother," has analogies in Latin *mater* and German *Mutter*. *Brat*, "brother," resembles, not only the English equivalent, but also the *Broder* of Danish and Swedish. *Noch*, "night," is from the same root as Latin *nox* (German *Nacht*). In other cases the likeness is confined to Latin, as in *vidyet*, "to see," resembling *videre*; *ogón*, "fire" (*ignis*), and *nóvy*, "new" (*novus*); or to Greek, as in *gora*, "mountain" (ὄρος); or to German, as in *lyubov*, "love" (*Liebe*). In the great bulk of Russian words, even when Grimm's law of consonantal interchange is called in to aid the inquirer, no resemblance can be discovered save in the case of a few foreign terms which have been incorporated into the language and provided with Russian endings. The language has methods of pronunciation which are far from being phonetic;

its accentuation of words is largely arbitrary and irregular.

But it is not with the modern language, thus modified by the wear and tear of centuries, that the story of Russian literature begins. The mass of the writings produced in the earlier period were committed to manuscript in Ecclesiastical Slavonic, which came only gradually to be mixed more or less with words borrowed from the speech of the people. It was in this church speech and in this early period that the monks wrote the chronicles — the famous annals of Kiev, as well as the more local chronicles of Nóvgorod, Tver, Súzdal, Volhynia, and Pskov — documents of little literary but of priceless historical value — and that there came into being a voluminous ecclesiastical literature, consisting mainly of sermons, "instructions," epistles, church histories, and religious hymns. There was meanwhile growing up a rich popular literature, which for centuries existed solely "in the mouths of the people." Part of it consisted of the magic formulæ, incantations, and petitionary sentences in which the ignorant peasant kept alive the memory of the heathen deities to whom he had so often appealed in his pagan past. There were also songs born of the emotions, suited to every mood of the mind, to every need of social entertainment, — songs for different seasons of the

year, such as the Christian *kolyády* and the songs of the "round dance," symbolizing the movements of the sun; songs sung at birth rejoicings and at marriage festivities; finally, funeral songs.

More important still were the *byliny*, or epic songs, in which the untutored Russian imagination is seen in its highest form of productivity. The earlier of these songs show us how the Russians apotheosized the great nature forces of their environment. They sing, for example, of the mountain giant, Svyatogór, who was so colossal that the earth could not carry him, and he had to lie across the mountains at full length. In other epic songs they describe the martyrdom of river heroes, who sacrifice themselves and their wives in order that, from their blood, the waters of the Don, the Dniepr, and other Russian streams may flow forth to bless the land. Or, personifying the land itself, as the Hindu personifies the objects on which his daily sustenance depends, they give heroic meaning to the occupation of agriculture in the conception of Mikula Selyanínovich, the sound of whose plough can be heard by the traveler at the distance of many days' journey. Then, as time went on, and the events of Russian history began to offer worthy materials of epic song, the *byliny* turned from the apotheosis of nature to the glorification of human exploits. Now came from these ruder

trouvères and troubadours of the northeast poetic compositions in praise of the nation's heroes. As recovered for literature by modern scholars like Kireyévsky and Rybnikov, these later epics in verse are found to form definite cycles, such as the cycle of Kiev, the cycle of Nóvgorod, the cycle of Moscow. They glorify warlike deeds, and tell of the achievements of the grand princes. Their favorite heroes — Prince Vladímir and his knightly followers, Ilyá of Murom, Dobrýnya Nikitich, Alyósha Popóvich, Miháilo Potok, Dyuk Stepánovich, Churílo Plenkóvich, and Solovéi Budimírovich — constitute a sort of "round table" of paladins whose duty it is to champion the cause of Russia against its pagan enemies. In one series of epic songs are celebrated the achievements of the Russian people in conflict with the Tatars; another takes its material from the power and deeds of Iván the Terrible. Often enough in these songs, fiction is mingled with the descriptions of real persons and events, while the so-called historical *byliny* are as frequently modified by magical elements suggested by the superstitions of the time. One of the most perfect of the legendary epics, the "Slovo o Polku Igorevé" (Word Concerning the Campaign of Igor), describes the campaign of the Russians against the Pólovtsy in 1185. Composed, according to Tikhonrávov, somewhere be-

tween the fourteenth and the sixteenth century, it is full of patriotic feeling, has many vivid descriptions of nature, and is remarkable, among other things, for the plaint of Igor's wife, Yaroslávna, who, apostrophizing the wind, blames it for favoring the arrows of the Khan, and then, addressing the Dniepr, commands it to bring her loved one home again. The song closes with this passage: "The sun shines in the heavens. The prince is in the Russian land. On the Dunai young girls have heard singing. The song brought by the waves of the sea finds its echo in Kiev. Igor arrives; he enters at Buchev to consult the image of the Mother of God of Porogosh. Joy in the hamlets! Joy in the cities! Everybody sings and glorifies the princes together — first the elders, then the young. And we also sing. Glory to Igor Svyatoslávich, — to the impetuous aurochs Vsévolod, glory! Glory to Vladímir, the falcon, son of Igor! Health to the princes, to their *druzhína*, that valiantly fought for the Cross against the pagans! Glory to the princes and their *druzhína!* Amen." All the songs, it must be remembered, existed originally only in an oral form, had to be transmitted from fathers to children, and were carried by professional singers in their wanderings to the remotest parts of the empire.

Under the depressing influences of the Tatar invasion, which for the time put an end to all progress in popular culture, literature remained largely ecclesiastical in material as well as in tone throughout the Moscow period. To this period belongs the Church Code, an important document discussing the condition of Russia, and setting forth proposed reforms in the church; a history of Iván the Terrible, by the monarch's prime minister, Kurbsky, forming the first example of Russian historical writing, as well as a number of letters which passed between Kurbsky and the Tsar Iván; and an account of the Tsardom of Kazán, by the priest Ivan Glazatsky; and the Domostróy, or "book of manners," compiled and perhaps also partly composed by the monk Sylvester. The whole literature of this Moscow period, up to the middle of the sixteenth century, took the manuscript form, owing to the failure of the Russians to utilize the art of printing until more than a hundred years after its discovery in western Europe. The first printing office in Russia was established at Moscow in 1563–64, under the patronage of Ivan IV. and the Metropolitan Makarius. But the people no sooner heard of its operations than an enraged mob, regarding them as due to sorcery, set the building on fire, and compelled the printers — Iván Feódorov and

Peter Timoféyev — to flee for their lives to Lithuania. Five years elapsed before a pupil of Feódorov founded a new printing office, from which were thereupon issued, first ecclesiastical books, — copies of the psalter, the Bible, liturgies, histories of the saints, — and then secular writings, including books of travel, and the earliest examples of fiction and story writing.

The outbreak of the schism in the seventeenth century gave rise to a flood of a new form of church literature, most of it directed against the sects. The first oasis in this wilderness of polemic came with the secular writings of Yury Kryzánich. This author, through his efforts to rouse the Russians to a consciousness of their solidarity with the other branches of the Slav stock, had the misfortune, at the very outset of his career, to be mistaken for an adventurer, and the government of Alexéi Mikhaílovich banished him to Tobólsk in 1661. It was in exile that he wrote "Politics" — a work which, conceived in a thoroughly patriotic spirit, contained an exhaustive criticism of the Russian character and Russian conditions, together with suggestions for the amelioration of both. Kryzhánich, who had been educated in Vienna, Bologna, and Rome, also produced a Panslavic grammar, which attracted the attention of philologists. Another important secular writing

of this period was Grigory Kotoshíkhin's account of Russia in the reign of Alexéi Mikhaílovich. Himself an official, the author did not hesitate to describe the evils of political and court life, as well as the corruption of judges and the cruelty practiced upon the serfs. The founding of the theatre in Russia during this reign did much to stimulate dramatic writing, though the first stage productions, composed by men like Simeon Polótsky and Dmitry Rostóvsky, were largely based on scriptural themes.

The reign of Peter, while characterized by phenomenal activity in the country's institutional life, shows little creative work in the department of literature. The very richness of *belles-lettres* in western Europe, where the classic writers of England and France had just composed their *chefs-d'œuvre*, could but serve to prolong in Russia those activities of absorption and imitation imposed upon the national mind by secular conditions. We get therefore in this period an abundance of translations from the French, English, Dutch, and classical tongues — among them versions of Molière's "Le Médecin Malgré Lui" and "Les Précieuses Ridicules." Books on pedagogy and various technical subjects abound. Krekshin writes a history of Peter the Great, and Matvéyev an account of "The Insurrection of the Streltsý."

The controversial writings of the time remind us that such men as Feofan Prokopóvich, Archbishop of Ryazan, Gavril Buzhinsky, and the Hieromonakh Simon Kokhanóvsky, threw their influence on the side of the reforms. The most prominent and distinguished littérateur of Peter's reign was Iván Tikhonóvich Pososhkóv (1670–1726.) His attitude of hostility to the sectarians was outspoken, nor did he scruple to side with the church against science in his denunciation of Copernicus as "a denier of God;" but his book on "Poverty and Riches," in which abuses of administration are severely handled, applied too rude a test to the tolerance of the authorities, for a year after issuing the work he was arrested and confined in the citadel of St. Petersburg, where he died. Perhaps the most promising sign of this period is the care which Peter, eager to ameliorate the material as well as the intellectual condition of his people, took to provide them with the best scientific thought of western Europe; and that he did this to some effect is suggested by the list of books which he caused to be translated into Russian — books which included the most important writings of Hugo Grotius, Puffendorf, Arend, Comenius, Justus Lipsius, and Bernouilli; Brinker's "Art of Shipbuilding;" Hübner's Geography, the astronomical and geographical works

of Huygens and Klüver, as well as, among classics, Æsop, Ovid, Curtius, etc.

By far the most important literary event of Peter's reign was the contribution it yielded to the completion of a process of the most vital significance for the development of Russian thought. This was the process which was to decide forever the function of Ecclesiastical Slavonic in the national life, and was to end by giving the people, for the first time in their history, a literary dialect. Russia had now reached the last stages of the struggle between the church language and the tongue of the common people — between dying forms of speech about to become classic and a vigorous young language which, developed by and constantly reacting on the popular thought, had grown more and more adapted to the purposes of literary expression. Ecclesiastical Slavonic, as we have seen, was the sole instrument of the Russian literary life in its earlier period; but when we reach the time of Peter the Great we find a literature made up of compositions in which both forms of speech have been utilized — writings in which the language of the common people mingles with the language of the church books. It was bad enough to have to use such a combination, amounting almost to a literary jargon, for the conveyance of thought; but the situation

was rendered still more deplorable by the prevailing license, which permitted each author not only to decide largely for himself in the matter of grammatical rules, but also to reach an individual judgment in regard to the rival claims of the two languages. Upon him also depended the use or disuse of a mass of foreign words and phrases — Latin, English, German, and Dutch — brought into Russian at various times. Yet by far the most important issue of the day was the issue between the speech of the church and the language of the common people; and the first successful effort to decide this issue in favor of the popular tongue was made by Lomonósov in the first half of the eighteenth century. It was he who not only formulated rules of Russian grammar, but also, by defining the place of Ecclesiastical Slavonic in literary composition, secured a definite realm for the speech of the people. Other writers carried vigorously forward the reform thus initiated; Ecclesiastical Slavonic continued to be more and more relieved of its literary function until finally, under the influence and example of Pushkin, the Russ, rendered lingually homogeneous and purified of incongruous elements, took its place as the literary dialect of the Russian people.

Russian literature, in the true meaning of the

term, really begins with the writings of the man who did so much to perfect his mother tongue as an instrument of literary expression. Nor is the story of Mikháil Vassílyevich Lomonósov (1712–65) wanting in romantic elements; for though born the son of a poor Arkhangel fisherman, and taught the rudiments of education by a friend, the lad not only contrived to complete his training by courses in German universities, but also so improved his natural abilities with study as to become beyond all question the most ably endowed Russian mind of his time. His acquirements in natural science, in several of the branches of which he was both teacher and experimenter, would alone have made him a commanding figure in the Russian culture movement. And though his chief significance for that movement rests on his achievements in the domain of language, Lomonósov could not content himself with the gift to his countrymen of polished speech forms in which they could henceforth write literature. Himself a poet, and determined that, like the countries of western Europe, Russia should also have poetry, he gave himself to the work of showing how it should be written. Bringing to his task a fine feeling for nature, early stimulated by the splendor of the northern heavens which had formed the canopy of his boyish occupations, Lomonósov

wrote verse, especially lyric verse, with effects of great freshness and beauty. The new life he thus wrought for literature had its effect upon all his contemporaries. Among the best known of these was Tredyakóvsky, who, besides translating extensively from the French, made important critical contributions to the theory of Russian verse; Kantemir, son of a naturalized Greek, who produced satires largely in imitation of the French school of pseudo-classicism; Sumarókov, who wrote for the stage, following Corneille and Racine; and Tatíshchev, who spent thirteen years in the production of a history of Russia.

With Catherine the Great, Russian literature entered what has been called its golden age. The monarch's own ambitions as an author, her predilection for the Encyclopædists, her success in gathering around her many of the great men of her time, all combined to give the literary life of Russia at the close of the eighteenth century a brilliance which it had never before displayed. It was in this period, thirty-four years in duration, that Fon Vízin developed his powers as a writer of comedies; that the famous court poet Derzhávin, of Tatar descent, wrote the somewhat pompous odes for which he is best remembered; and that Radíshchev described the institution of serfdom in a way to bring down upon him the wrath

of Catherine and the punishment of her judges. Nor were lesser lights lacking in a reign which made literary pretensions a passport to all the forms of fashionable life — men like Petrov, composer of odes, and translator of Milton's Paradise Lost; Feódor Emin, the story writer; Geráskov, of Wallachian ancestry, author of narrative poems and dramas; Bogdanóvich, the Little-Russian dramatist and comedy writer; and Khemnitser, whose genius spent itself in fables in the style of Gellert and La Fontaine. The Empress herself added considerably, in numerous comedies, poems, sketches, etc., — to say nothing of her achievements in the field of history and language, — to the literary yield of a period which, also, by the way, included the talented Princess Dashkóv in the list of its women devoted to literature. It must, nevertheless, be admitted that, despite the brilliance of Catherine's salon and its surroundings, Russia had yet to see the development of a national literature worthy of the name. The work of Russian writers was still largely imitative and foreign; in too many cases, moreover, the conditions degraded literary production to the level of paid eulogy.

The nineteenth century opened with the promise of better things. Its sufficient augury was Karamzín, a man of many-sided literary endowment,

whose classical "History of the Russian Empire," besides displaying a mastery of Russian style, presents the Russian language in its final stage of perfection as a literary tongue. Kryl6v, his contemporary, though also a writer of odes, comedies, and operas, is best known as a writer of fables, in some 200 of which he successfully embodied the practical good sense, the humor, and also the patriotism of the common people. The famous culture comedy "Sorrow from Brains," written by Griboyédov, also belongs to this period. But the pseudo-classicism which Russia had borrowed from the French was now passing away; and with Zhukóvsky's conversion to the poetry of the romantic legends, the minnesongs, and the popular ballads of the German middle ages, as expressed in the productions of Goethe and Schiller, Russian literature found itself carried powerfully in the direction of romanticism. Into that literature now came, with vivifying influence and creative power, the master spirit of the new movement, as well as the leading poet of Russia.

Alexander Sergéyevich Pushkin, born an aristocrat, had the hot blood of the negro race flowing in his veins through descent on his mother's side from a native Abyssinian. Compared with the poems of Pushkin, the productions of the official littérateurs who had preceded him, — the odes

and lyrics which, at the courts of at least two empresses, had been largely made to order, — were indeed "as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine." For well-nigh the first time in the history of the Russians, there was now a man among them who sang from stress of inward emotion, yet in whom the mechanism of literary expression was so perfectly correlated with the sources of feeling and thought as to give his poetry that air of spontaneity and inspiration which Russian verse had hitherto lacked. To the elements of romanticism, as comprehended by Zhukóvsky — mere delight in the past, taste for the wonderful, love of the magical and marvelous — Pushkin added the use of national materials; and in writings like "The Fountain of Bakchiserái," a product of his sojourn in the Crimea, and "Ruslan and Ludmíla," echoing the legends told him when a boy by his nurse, Pushkin opened the way for the exploitation of rich stores of material which had long been neglected. Under the stimulus of historical studies, inspired especially by the reading of Shakespeare, the poet composed the classic drama "Boris Godunóv," printed in 1831. Some of Pushkin's social experiences found expression in "Yevgeni Onyegin," a half-serious, half-satirical narrative poem, suggested by Don Juan; and here, in the character of Tatyana, the author has

created one of the most attractive types of women to be found in Russian literature.

But Russia could not long supply that aristocracy of genius which is essential to all supreme efforts in the realm of the creative imagination. The time was in fact approaching when the Russian, like the west-European, mind would also direct its literary ambition into more democratic and more useful fields. For a while Lérmontov — familiar with the Caucasus, first as a traveler, and then as an exile — maintained the traditions of the romantic school, and won undoubted fame as a poet. His lyrical verse, as well as his longer narrative poems, catch something of their color from experiences which had made him not only a sceptic in religion, but also an irreconcilable opponent of the autocracy. Working constantly under the Byronic influence, he gave ample expression to that *Weltschmerz* which had by this time invaded all the higher thought of Russia. His most lengthy poetical composition was "The Demon," a poem of passion; his chief prose work, "A Hero of our Time," contains the absorbing adventures of a Byronesque hero, Pechórin, whose story is narrated by himself in the form of a diary. There is much pessimism in Lérmontov's writings, yet they are always touched by the tender melancholy with which the poet knew how to make even his moods of profoundest dejection fascinating.

The transition from romanticism in Russia was neither difficult nor prolonged; for realism had been a latent tendency in Russian literature since the beginning of the century. Yet its sudden development in Gógol wrought a change in the whole art and practice of literature. It was not only that Russian writers ceased from their imitative subservience to foreign models, — a new view of the function of literature asserted itself. Under the stimulus of modern scientific knowledge, as well as of the philosophical discussions of the forties, Russian writers, from dealing with subjects of fanciful, imaginative, and theoretical interest, now began to occupy themselves with questions affecting the welfare of the individual and the race. From the thought of the perfection of man and society, they passed naturally enough to the consideration of national problems, and did their utmost, not only to emphasize the evils which they recognized, but also — so far as a rigorous censorship would permit — to suggest means of amelioration. Hence it was that since Gógol wrote his "Revisor" and "Dead Souls" — works in which with a laughing face, from which tears are flowing, the novelist began again, a long way after Radíshchev, the attack upon remediable Russian conditions, Russian literature has never wholly or for long left the field of sociological problems. The

lash was also wielded by Saltykóv, whose satire condensed itself so successfully in "Government Sketches," "Pompadury i Pompadurshi," "The Tashkendians," and "The Letters to My Aunt." Another writer who strove in behalf of the enslaved peasants was the poet Nekrásov — a man who, near to the people, knew their life intimately, and never tired of depicting it in musical, heart-moving verse. The genius of Dostoyévsky also gave itself to social questions — healthily enough in "Poor People," which tells the story of the city proletariat in a way to arouse sympathy with a whole class; more morbidly, yet more powerfully, in "Crime and Punishment," where a peculiarly horrible murder is made the text of a highly questionable theory of individual regeneration. Goncharóv's "Oblómov" takes its name from the hero of the story, in whose faculty for the elaboration of great schemes which he has not the executive energy to carry to realization Russians have very generally recognized one of their racial failings. In Chernishévsky's "What's to be Done?" we find a publicist, critic, and political economist formulating a plan of industrial reform in the guise of a love story. The comedies of Ostróvsky showed an intimate knowledge of the Russian merchant of the old type, with its rigid adherence to the Orthodox faith, and its strict family life of the Domostróy

period. Finally, the Nihilistic or revolutionary movement not only supplied the motive of some of the finest of Tourguéneff's stories — among them "Fathers and Children," "Virgin Soil," and "Smoke" — but also called into being Dostoyévsky's "Demons," Goncharóv's "Precipice," and Písemsky's "Troubled Sea."

Tourguéneff is one of the few Russian writers who have gained a world-wide reputation. Though a poet, as well as a novel-writer, his best work has been done in the field of the romance. Here the artistic motive predominates; the writer is sparing of words, and has a way of compressing his thought into small compass which reminds one of impressionism. All his books are condensed, and each may be perused at a single sitting; the style, moreover, is one of exquisite literary finish. The charm of Tourguéneff's women types has been widely admired. Some of his novels are absorbing descriptions of family life, such as "A Nest of Gentlemen," "On the Eve," "First Love," etc. In another class of stories the novelist describes the social and political conditions of Russian life in the fifties and sixties. The most famous of them, "Fathers and Children" (1861), contains the sketch of a revolutionary type, Bazárov, which the Russian liberals generally condemned as a caricature of their tendencies and aspirations,

though by the more radical fraction Bazárov was accepted as a model.

The best known of the literary realists of Russia is Count Leo Tolstóy — a man ripe in years, yet rich in literary achievement, who is still sending forth from his country seat at Yásnaya Polyána those productions which the civilized world awaits with an interest which has been accorded to no other writer of Slav nationality. The philosopher and mystic of Russian *belles-lettres*, by excellence, Tolstóy excels in the imaginative development of events from the operation of sociological laws. With an enormous grasp of types and situations, he tells not so much what did happen as what might have happened. His smaller sketches resemble photographs retouched and colored; his larger canvases, crowded with figures, convey the impression of living panoramas. In his "Sebastópol Sketches" (1854) Tolstóy has depicted war with a fullness and respect for actuality which have never been surpassed. His "War and Peace" (1865–68) gives a strikingly vivid picture of Russian life at the beginning of the century, wherein the fortunes of two aristocratic families — the Rostóvs and the Bolkónskys — form the focus of interest around which are grouped the chief events of the patriotic campaign against Napoleon. Among his best known

stories is "Anna Karénina," in which the consequences of a marriage without love — which is seen to lead, first to a love without marriage, and finally, under social stress, to a suicide — are set forth with admirable power of analysis. A few years ago, disavowing his literary work as worthless, Tolstóy began the statement of his religious views, and has since given himself up wholly to the development of a theory of social reform in which many features of civilized life are condemned as evil. The latest production from his pen, entitled "Resurrection," written in the pecuniary interest of the exiled and persecuted Dukhobórtsy, deals with one of the author's favorite social problems.

Realism, it may finally be said, is still the distinguishing note of literary production in Russia; and its representatives, who include women as well as men, are for the most part still striving in the interest, not of merely artistic ends, but of some transcendent purpose of social utility which they wish to see realized. This, indeed, has been to such an extent the dominating motive in the expression of Russian thought for forty years past that if it were possible to characterize in a single sentence the whole period which has elapsed since the appearance of Gógol, it could be done best perhaps by the statement that among all the world

literatures which make up the sum of our intellectual possessions as a race, the Russian must ever be conspicuous for the intensity of its devotion to human welfare, as well as for the completeness with which it has combined artistic with humanitarian ends.

XIII

THE RUSSIAN FUTURE

Such has been the historical development of Russia; such are the chief features of her civilization. Centuries of growth have given her a continuous territorial extent superior to that of any other nation on the planet. With enormous resources; with immense populations from which to recruit her armies; with her questions of foreign aggrandizement turning not on the popular will, but on the simple decision of the ruler, Russia is enabled on land and sea to play the part, not only of a nation among nations, but of a first-class military power. Yet when we turn to her internal life, we find that in respect of both political and religious institutions she is not only not modern, but that she is living at least 400 years *en retard* as compared with western Europe. How largely her home problems have been neglected may be seen in the fact that, in portions of the empire, such as Great-Russia, the proportion of illiteracy rises as high as 94 per cent. Her land system, upon which depend the occupation

and sustenance of the great bulk of her people, has now reached a condition of crisis, the feverish pulse beats of which are periodically announced to the world in rhythmically recurring famines. Russia supports, in her mediæval church, a superstitious and unprogressive religion, repudiated in form by millions of her uneducated, rejected in substance and outright by most of her subjects who have any claim to culture. She is to-day, moreover, as devoid of free political institutions as she was in the times of Iván the Terrible; after ages of contact with Europe, her people accept the will of an autocrat, entrenched in the loyalty of the peasants, as the supreme law. Not one of the 150,000,000 of her population has the slightest voice in determining her home or foreign policies. Fearing free discussion far more than the plague, her absolutist régime punishes alike the political aspirations of her educated minority and that religious dissent of her masses which dares to diverge from the prescribed faith of the Orthodox Church. Denying to the political and religious offender the right of trial by jury, elsewhere centuries old, Russia refuses, to press and platform, privileges granted even to the Maoris of New Zealand, and maintains in the "administrative process" the same odious system of *lettres de cachet* as that which in the eighteenth century provoked against France the indignation of all Europe.

How far, then, may such a power as Russia — a veritable fifteenth century state wearing the habiliments of the nineteenth, a power burdened with responsibilities abroad, harassed by disaffection at home, expanded territorially beyond all manageable as well as reasonable limits — hope to perpetuate itself as an autocracy? For answer we must consider at greater length the internal weakness that underlies much of the brave show which Russia is still enabled to make to the world as a first-class military power. Her most vital interest to-day is agriculture. Forty years after emancipation, the industry and loyalty of the peasant continue to constitute the chief support of the Russian system. Not only do the peasantry maintain the autocratic form of government, they contribute the great bulk of the expenditures of the empire. It is, moreover, from the ranks of the agriculturists that the Russian armies are recruited; it is the brawn and sinew developed in the Russian villages which have enabled the colonizer of the northeast to carry the Russian flag far towards the Pacific; from the same source have issued the pluck and dash which have wrested the bulk of Central Asia from the nomad, and have made its desert blossom like a garden. Yet the peasants of Russia are poorer as a class than they were before 1861. Splendidly

responsive to the plans of military generals, they seem to be growing less and less able to take care of themselves. Feeders of empire, they themselves are compelled to live from hand to mouth ; in years of want they die of hunger by thousands. Meanwhile the conditions of agriculture in Russia are steadily going from bad to worse. Repeated failures of the crops in certain districts, alternating with an occasional great famine — such as that of 1891–92, as well as the later, only less severe, visitation of 1898 — sufficiently show the peril which menaces those economical conditions from which the masses of the Russian people draw their livelihood, and on which the autocratic régime depends so largely for its income.

To this source of discontent, moreover, must be added the reactionary measures which have gone far towards nullifying, not only the benefits conferred by the Emancipation Act, but also the other reforms with which it was accompanied. It was the purpose of the legislation of 1861, not only to emancipate the peasant, but also to free him from the guardianship and autocratic authority — exercised now as police officer, now as judge, and now as general agent of the state — which the manorial lords had exerted since the beginning of the eighteenth century. The emancipation ukaz deprived this class of all further participation in the affairs

of the peasant communes, yet by various acts of subsequent legislation the government re-admitted them to the functions from which they had been ousted. The first sign of this reaction manifested itself in the changed character of the "arbitrators of the peace" — officers whom the government intrusted (1862–63) with the duty of mediating between the peasants and the land-owning class in questions such as the allotment of land, arising out of emancipation. These functionaries, at first chosen from the best representatives of the nobility, gradually became venal and corrupt. In 1874 the functions of this class were transferred to police officials; while in 1889 the government returned to power over the peasantry certain members of the local nobility, as paid state officers, under the title of "chiefs of the rural cantons." These officers now wield unlimited judicial and executive power in the villages under their care. The press is forbidden, under severe penalties, to publish complaints against them; they have in their own hands all appeals which may be made against their decisions; such responsibility as they acknowledge is a merely nominal and official one to the governor of the province. With the appointment of the peasant judges under his control, with power to compel the peasant to work on his estate, as well as to flog the man at his will, the rural

officer of to-day seems to play a part not greatly unlike that exercised by the manorial lord in the old days of serfdom. The legislation, moreover, which has thus, in twenty provinces of Central Russia, replaced the justices of the peace appointed in connection with emancipation, by chiefs of rural cantons, has recently been applied to Siberia (June, 1898), and is soon (1901) to be extended to the western governments of Russia and to Poland. Meanwhile, by restrictions imposed (1890) upon the *zemstva*, the Russian government has considerably modified the former popular character of these provincial assemblies.

Reaction is also manifest in the administration of the Russian cities, where municipal government, with its powers materially reduced by the ukaz of 1894, has been placed almost entirely under chiefs nominated by the Emperor himself. Yet there are signs of a new life in the urban centres of population, due partly to the movement of growth in which they are engaged, and partly to the appearance in them of the large industrial class which they are so powerfully aiding to develop. It used to be urged that Russia is too exclusively a country of rural populations to produce or be fitted for political institutions similar to those which prevail in the West. But the conditions relied on in such an argument are beginning to pass away. The

facts cited by Milyukov[1] show a considerable comparative increase of the city populations. Thus in 1724 the percentage of city people to the total inhabitants of Russia was 3.00, or 328,000 people living in cities; in 1782 the city dwellers numbered 800,000, or a percentage of 3.1. These figures increased in 1796 to 1,301,000 and 4.1 per cent; in 1812 to 1,653,000, or 4.4 per cent; in 1835 to 3,025,000, or 5.8 per cent; in 1851 to 3,482,000, or 7.8 per cent; in 1878 to 6,091,000, or 9.2 per cent; and in 1890 to 13,948,000, or 12.8 per cent. In other words, the proportion of city to rural people has been multiplied four times since 1724, three times since 1812, and twice since 1840 or thereabouts. In the time of Peter the Great there were no more than 250 cities in the whole of Russia. In the middle of the present century, out of 1000 Russian cities, 878 had fewer than 10,000 inhabitants, and only 32 more than 20,000. In 1870, as described in 1873 by Schwanenbach, 27 Russian towns had a population of 1000; 74 between 1000 and 2000; 194 between 2000 and 5000; 179 between 5000 and 10,000; 55 between 10,000 and 15,000; 35 between 15,000 and 25,000; 23 between 25,000 and 50,000; and 8 over 50,000. At the present time 40 cities have more than

[1] *Glavniya Techeniya Russkoy Istoricheskoy Mysli* (The Chief Currents of Historical Ideas in Russia), vol. i., Moscow, 1898.

20,000; 35 between 50,000 and 100,000; 19 more than 100,000; and 7 more than 150,000. The actual population of the Russian empire (census of 1897) is 129,211,114, of which European Russia has 94,188,750. It should be added, as showing the modification which the former exclusive occupation of the peasant classes with agriculture is undergoing, that, in addition to the 1,500,000 men who constitute the factory workers of Russia, there are no fewer than 4,000,000 peasants who, besides tilling the soil, carry on various village industries. This development of the Russian cities, and of the industrial life within them, with its creation of a capital-and-labor problem not wanting in serious phases, such as occasional collisions between angry workmen and the authorities, points to a significant change in Russian conditions, and must contribute to the quickening of political ambition among the rural as well as the urban populations of Russia.

What, then, with such cause for discontent among the peasants and artisans, may not be expected from the educated classes, whose knowledge of countries constitutionally governed has made them eager for reform? It was in the heart of these classes that the revolutionary movement had its origin; and though the acute phases of that movement are over, — let us hope forever, — the

fact remains that the tradition of political conspiracy in Russia is far from being dead. The chief cities are still centres of propaganda; the reform agitation in the colleges and universities — long a chronic accompaniment of educational processes in Russia — has been much intensified in recent years by the arbitrary use of police and military power in the suppression of so-called "students' disturbances." The monthly lists of arrests for "political infidelity" which the Russian organs in Geneva and London [1] publish regularly would alone suffice to show that autocratic government in Russia is still grappling with the problem of political disaffection. It cannot now claim to be engaged in any struggle with assassins, for there is no assassination. Conspiracy in Russia to-day is mainly an effort to assert rights of criticism, free speech and public meeting granted in every other country in Europe; the effort to suppress conspiracy is for the most part the effort to suspend the law of progress — to nullify that process of intellectual variation on which all national as well as all individual advance finally depends.

Nor is Russia, which at the Hague Confer-

[1] See, in Russian, the *Materials for the History of the Socialistic-Revolutionary Movement*, periodically issued in Geneva; also the "Flying Sheets" (*Letuchiyi Listki*) published by the Russian Free Press Fund in London.

ence sought to promote the world's peace, within measurable distance of the peace — the peace even of simple unity — which ought to prevail within her own borders. She boasts — or the boast is made for her — that "To every race she gives a home, And creeds and laws enjoy her shade." Such a claim may be valid for her attitude towards the peoples of Central Asia; it cannot pretend to any justification in the European division of her empire. For here her recent history presents the spectacle of entire nationalities whose sympathy she has repelled, whose sentiment she has alienated, in the unwise effort to make them, in language, faith, and custom, an integral part of herself. In Asia, the semi-barbarian finds his race-life untouched; in European Russia cultured peoples are despoiled of the things they hold almost as dear as existence itself — the Poles of their language, the Little-Russians of their literature, the Baltic Germans of their religion, the Finlanders of their constitution. And if to these sources of division we add others — those antagonisms of interest, for example, which disfranchise and degrade one section of the population with the whole force of another; the conditions which exclude large classes of the population from the benefits of education; a political system which divides the people into Tsar worshipers and po-

litical malcontents, and a religious system which opposes pronounced types of agnosticism to primitive forms of superstition — we shall be led to recognize that the metaphor of a "house divided against itself" is not without a certain application to this modern empire of two continents.

How, then, has Russia thus far been able to maintain her system, her prestige as a military power? Much of her immunity in the past has been due to her isolation — to the fact that she has been able to accumulate her resources and consolidate her empire at a distance from the contending states of modern Europe. Her want of ocean frontier has for ages bulwarked her from foreign aggression. Yet this separateness from the first-class fighting nations cannot last forever. By coming rearrangements of border lines in the West, or by hostile contacts in the far East, Russia must finally draw into that closeness of relation with the other great powers which is the destiny of all civilized races living a common life on the same round world. And in that time her resources will be, not the barriers which nature has reared, or which man artificially maintains, but the power of her people to compete with the other peoples in the things which make for national strength and greatness. Even in a competition of peace, it will be "the restless force of Europe's

mind" rather than "the patient faith of Asia's heart" which will avail; but should the competition be one of arms, Russia will hold her own only to the extent that the surpassing bravery of her individual soldier, the splendid inertia of her fighting squares, is supplemented by the intelligence, the mental alertness, the power of initiative, the scientific training and technical skill to which all modern success in war has been due. Did the peril which seems to menace her future come only from her religious conditions, Russia would still need the warning conveyed to her by the events of recent history. For a nation which cannot lift itself out of ecclesiasticism — which persists in living as if it were from the church and from church customs, and not from the spirit of free investigation, from the practice of free thought and free speech, that the social efficiency of peoples is to come — such a nation may pride itself on its enormous extent of territory, on its growing and already mighty population, most of all, perhaps, on its unity in the faith received from the fathers, yet it is destined to collapse, as Spain collapsed, at the first decisive touch of a virile modern race.

Perhaps there is a likelihood of reform from within? The chances of a "palace revolution" have passed away with the exclusively Oriental

conditions in which such movements have their origin; the chances of a military insurrection are every day growing more meagre; the chances of a rising of the people may for the present be left entirely out of account. A military disaster, similar to, yet on a larger scale than that of the Crimea, might very well revolutionize the political system of Russia, and would do this more efficaciously than any other known agency. But should the country have to await the result of developmental conditions, it must look to education and industry for the changes desired, and to education especially, since in the last few years there has been an unwonted multiplication of schools for the people, due largely to the enterprise of the provincial assemblies. Thus far the prospect of reform as a result of imperial initiative is slender in the extreme. The Tsars still shelter themselves under the plea that there is something peculiar in Russian conditions and in the Russian people which makes autocracy indispensable, — though such a position is negatived by the scientific view of history, which, showing a process fundamentally alike for all races, teaches that they pass from a stage in which the power of a people is wielded for the people to a stage in which it is wielded by the people. The claim, again, that the Russian people are incapable of participation in the duties

of the general government is sufficiently discounted by their long experience in the work of the *mir*, and of other forms of local self-government.

Much has been said regarding the inertia of the official class, as well as of the resistance to change sure to be offered to radical reforms by so conservative a people as the peasants. Against this must be urged that the Russians possess a degree of the power of self-adaptation to new conditions not met with in any other country in the world. They have been "changing all that" from the earliest periods of their history. It was a new beginning when the people threw off the pagan yoke and embraced Christianity; another when they broke with the traditions of Kiev and the *udyélny* system; still another when, under the influence of Peter, they gave up old Russian customs for the civilization of the West. On three or four occasions did the Russians change their capital, to look around them each time with a new mind, as well as to have over them a different sky. In the seventeenth century thousands of Russians separated themselves from the national church for a change of faith, with which they are still content; in the nineteenth, millions of them, after centuries of serfdom, re-adapted their lives to the comparatively strange conditions created by freedom. Even now, at the heart of the revolutionary

movement, there seems the foreboding of the still greater change which is to add these thousands and millions, as well as other thousands and millions, to the list of peoples who, from a state of mere bodily freedom, have grown also into political liberty. It is, moreover, this same historic race trait — this power of self-adaptation to new conditions — which is meant in the phrase "the new generation" so constantly heard in modern Russia, it being there well understood that a single generation frequently suffices to give some new and important direction to the intellectual or social tendencies of the people. Whence it may be urged without exaggeration that if constitutional reforms were granted in Russia, two generations would suffice to graft them upon the nation's life.

Such a view acquires additional strength from the fact that the principle of popular representation in the government of Russia is deeply impressed upon the national history, and that the Tsars have more than once admitted the principle, not only in the local, but also in the general affairs of the nation. The practice of calling *sobory*, or representative assemblies of the people, began immediately after the suppression of the folk-motes by the grand princes of Moscow. Between 1550 and 1698 inclusive, no fewer than fifteen or sixteen of these assemblies were called. Their

function was usually consultative — to decide whether war should be undertaken, certain taxes levied, internal disorder abolished, and so forth. The assemblies were differently constituted, according to the monarch and the occasion. In particular cases, the representation was of a single estate, such as the *sobor* of 1617, which was made up chiefly of Moscow merchants. Usually, though not exclusively, it was a representation of the nobility, the bureaucracy, the clergy, the military, and the inhabitants of the cities and rural districts, together with (as in 1614 and 1682) the crown peasants and the merchants of Moscow. The assembly usually sat in the hall of Moscow, known as the Granovítaya Paláta, or, by exception, in the Palace of the Patriarch and the Uspensky Cathedral. The decisions reached were embodied in a document called "The General Verdict of the Land." These Russian "states-general" were never abolished by law, and a careful student of them [1] declares that no legal act whatever lies in the way of a new convocation of the representatives of the empire. They are important as showing that the right of the people to be at least consulted on national affairs has always been recognized. Not only did Catherine

[1] Maxime Kovalevsky. See *Modern Customs and Ancient Laws of Russia.*

the Great coquet with the idea of popular institutions in her "High Commission;" the scheme of a constitution was prepared by one of the ministers of Alexander I.; even so recently as 1881 Alexander II. could seriously "consider" the idea of a national assembly for Russia.

We are thus entitled to regard the autocratic régime in Russia as maintained, not in the interest of the people, but in the interest of a ruling class, which is doubtless sincere enough to believe that the interest of the people coincides with its own. Hence we must interpret the courage with which the principle of autocracy is to be defended in Russia, as well as the "divine right" which finds expression in that courage, as signifying nothing more than the consciousness in the minds of the Tsar and his advisers that they have on their side the wills, and therefore the embodied power, of the great majority of the Russian people. Against the dismal but undoubted fact that their right to oppress the cultured and politically ambitious class is thus maintained by the ignorant and unprogressive class, may fairly be placed the far more encouraging fact that, however much the Tsars may refuse to shorten, they cannot help but contribute to, the process which is slowly but surely transforming Russia. Cling as they may to personal power, they cannot choose but promote the

very changes which are to make them and their function unnecessary. As the work done by the first rulers of Russia in furthering contact with the West brought on the religious protest; as the Europeanization movement so powerfully led by Peter the Great forced the first clash of disaffection under Nicholas I.; and as the culture processes set up by Alexander I. and his successors supplied the motive of the revolutionary movement, so the measures taken under Nicholas II. in the present reign — measures for the encouragement of industry and the spread of education among the people — are steadily making for the new conditions by which Russia is to be regenerated.

A word in conclusion. The people of Russia have shown that they possess qualities and aptitudes which will ensure to them a future of potency, even of splendor, in the coming progress of the world. Submerged for 300 years in the night of the Tatar-Mongol domination; deprived of an advanced civilization for centuries after it had illumined the West; too early plunged into the whirlpool of European politics; compelled to spend energies needed at home in wars of expansion or conquest; torn all the while by conflict between the conservatism of an inheritance from Asia and the progressive spirit which drew them

irresistibly to Europe — the Russians have already, if we consider merely the difficulties overcome, attained to a position of the first rank in national achievement. All the while, moreover, they have displayed a patience under humiliation, a resilience from disaster, and a power of self-sacrifice in the pursuit of ideal ends, which qualify them, if anything could, for national greatness. But they cannot reach their full stature as a people while a foreign caste — an autocracy which, as such, has already completed its historic part in their development — continues to hold them, largely in its own interest, to inadequate institutional forms elsewhere long outgrown, — forms which, degrading their social efficiency to well-nigh mediæval levels, not only disqualify them for tasks of world-unification, but also threaten the integrity of their national life.

The Russian government, by a policy of expansion and conquest, as well as by its maintenance of a large standing army, and its use of expensive modern armaments, may succeed for yet other decades in diverting attention from internal questions and in playing before Europe and the United States the part of a great world power. A combination of favorable circumstances might even enable it to delay for a considerable period that military collapse which sooner or later must over-

take the nation driven into continually closer association and severer competition with powers higher and more efficient than itself in the order of sociological and political development. Yet the result cannot be permanently delayed. A people thus endowed and thus environed is fated not only to fully retrieve the isolations and deprivations of its past, but also to enter completely into the heritage which the future so manifestly has in store for it. Russian progress may be slow, if left altogether to educational and industrial processes. But it will be none the less inevitable. The great movements of sociological advance, retarded as they may be by individual interest, finally carry Tsars as well as nations along with them. It is the close connection existing between popular progress and political progress which makes the cause of industrial emancipation in Russia so full of promise, and enables us to find the hope of a Russian "government for the people, of the people, and by the people," even in the dream and prophecy of an American protagonist of freedom: —

> "The peasant brain shall yet be wise,
> The untamed pulse grow calm and still;
> The blind shall see, the lowly rise,
> And work in peace Time's wondrous will."

INDEX

Afanasiev, Iván, 183.
Agriculture, 13, 254, 255, 257.
Aigun, Treaty of, 185.
Aix-la-Chapelle, Treaty of, 92.
Alexander First, ascends the throne, 105; alliance with France, 105; interview with Napoleon at Erfurt, 105; calls Europe to arms against Buonaparte, 107; becomes King of Poland, 107; education, character, and reforms of, 108; introduces reactionary policies, 109; death of, 109.
Alexander Second, appearance, character, and education, 123; end of Crimean War, 123; emancipates serfs, 132; other administrative reforms, 136, 137.
Alexander Third, redemption of land made compulsory, 133; succeeds to the throne, 154; shelves the Mélikov reform scheme, 154; reactionary policies of, 155; decree giving freedom of worship to Old Believers, 172; persecution of the Dukhobórtsy, 172; death of, 156.
Alexéi Mikháilovich, accession to the throne, 65; social reforms of, 66; writings in the reign of, 237, 238.
Alexéi Petróvich, son of Peter the Great, plots against his father, 82; dies under punishment, 83.
Amur, 184.
Anna Iványovna, 84–88; predilection for Germans, 85, 86; personal traits, 86, 87; arranges an "ice wedding," 87; residence of, in Moscow, 88; receives surrender of the Kirghiz Middle Horde, 188.
Anna Leopóldovna, 88.
Antakólsky, sculptor, 181.
Apraxin, 72.
Arctic Ocean, frontage to, 7.
Asiatic possessions, 198.
Atlásov, Vladímir, takes possession of Kamchátka, 184.
Auguste Second, 84, 88.
Autocracy, progress towards, 39–56; substitution of, for federated republics, 56; changes resulting from setting up of, 57, 58; maintained in the interest of a ruling class, 270; threatened with military collapse, 272,273.
Azov, campaign of Peter the Great against, 69.

Baikál, Lake, 183.
Baltic Germans, 263.
Baltic secured for Russia by Peter the Great, 72; autonomous government of, disappears, 155.
Baty, Tatar-Mongol leader, 52.
Bazárov, revolutionary type, 250.
Beard, prohibition of, 78, 163.
Berézov, 183.
Berlin, Treaty of, 124.
Bessarabia, acquirement of, 180.
Birón, favorite of Anna Iványovna, 85, 86, 93.
Black Sea, 7, 8.
Blagovéshchensk, 185.
Bogdanóvich, Little-Russian dramatist, 244.
Bogolyúbov, 150.
Bogolyúbsky, 46, 53, 54.
Boyáry, military class, 44.
Bukhará, 188, 190; defeat of its army by Romanóvsky, 190.
Bukharest, Treaty of, 180.
Byzantinism, influence of, upon Russia, 16, 27, 38; a lost cause, 66; position of women under, 142, 143.

Caspian Sea, 7, 8.
Catherine First, 76, 77, 82, 83.
Catherine Second (the Great), German origin of, 94; her husband becomes Peter Third, 92; conspires to obtain the throne, 95; abdication and murder of Peter Third, 95; the "High Commission" of, 97; reforms of, 95–97; personal appearance, character, and ambitions of, 97–99; literary activity, 98–100, 243, 244; punishes Radíshchev, the reformer, 100; death of, 101.
Caucasus, territory of, passes to Russia, 180, 181; influence of, upon Russian literature, 247.
Central Asia, source of invasion, 187; earliest official relations with, 188, 189; Kirghiz become subject to Russia, 188, 189; Chernáyev takes Chemkent and receives submission of Tashkent, 189; Gortchakóff explains Russian policy in, to the Powers, 190; Bukharan force defeated by Gen. Romanóvsky, 190; defeat of conjoined troops of Khiva and Bukhará by Kaufmann, 191; fall of Samarkand, 191; massacre of the Turkoman Yomuds, 192; Khivan territory annexed, 192; Schouváloff's disclaimer to the Powers, 192; Khokandian army defeated, 192, 193; annexation of Khokand, 193; Tekké-Turkomans, 193; defeat of Gen. Lomákin, 194; Tekké fortification stormed by Skóbelev, 195; massacre of Tekkés, 195; recall of Skóbelev, 196; acquisition of Merv and the Merv oasis, 196; expansion in a state policy, 199; relation of government policy in, to actions of military leaders, 199.
Charles Thirteenth cedes Finland and Bothnia, 106, 107.
Charles Twelfth defeated by Peter the Great, 72.
Chelyádin stabbed by Ivan the Terrible, 56.
Chemkent, 189.
Chernáyev, Gen., 189.
Chinese, attitude of, towards Russian advance, 198.
Christ personified in sects, 171.
Christianity, influence of, upon early Russian life, 28–30, 38, 39; connection of, with principle of autocratic rule, 39.
"Christians," name given to the peasants by the Tatar-Mongols, 113.
Church, property of, secularized, 27; solidarity of revolutionists with movement against, 159, 160; Russian liberals and, 159; resemblances of Russian, to Greek, 162; schism in, 159–165; general movement of dissent from teachings of, 165–171; proselytism in, 175.
Church Code, 236.
Cities, poorly developed, 13, 14; growth of, 259–261.
Civil wars, 40, 41.
Commerce, early, of Russia, 36.
Communists, religious sect, 170.
Constantinople, 16.
Constitution, scheme of, for Russia, by Speránsky, 108; by Loris Mélikov, 153, 154.
Corneille, imitation of, 243.
Cossacks in Siberia, 183; in Central Asia, 188.
Crimean War, 122, 125.
Culture, retardation of, by geographical position and religious faith, 17, 19, 20, 21; retardation of, by language, 18; contrast of Russian, with west European, 19, 22.
Culture movement, its protest against autocracy, 115.
Cyrillus, missionary, 228; script invented by, 228, 229.

"Dancers," sect, 170.
Danghil-Tepe, 194.
Daniel Alexándrovich, 53.
"Dead Souls," novel by Gógol, 248.
"Decembrists," conspiracy and insurrection of, 118, 119; in exile, 219, 220; movement of, revived, 145.
Derzhávin, poet, 243.
Dissent, general movement of, 165–171.
Dniepr, 10.
Dolgorúky, Prince, founder of Moscow, 51, 52.

Domostróy, 142, 143, 144, 236; comedies illustrating period of, 249.
Dostoyévsky, novelist, treatment of, as an exile, 220–223; life in Siberia of, 222; writings of, 249.
Dress reform, 77, 78.
Druzhína, prince's armed band, 35.
Dukhobórtsy ("Spirit Wrestlers"), 167, 172, 173; novel written in their interest, 252.

Ecclesiasticism, 265.
Education, reform of, 136, 137; in the sixties, 144; obstacles placed in the way of, 145, 146; Tolstóy's plan of, to counteract "Nihilism," 147; disabilities imposed upon the Jews in, 174.
Elizabeth Petróvna, accession of, 89; personality, character, and education, 90; a zealous persecutor, 91; wages war against the Swedes, 92.
Emancipation Act, 132–138; stimulates the demand for political rights, 146.
Encyclopedists, 127.
Étape houses in Siberia, 213, 214.
Europeanization, in time of Peter the Great, 59–84; as wrought by commerce, 62, 63.
Expansion, territorial, rate and extent of, 198; energies employed in, operate against political progress, 199.

Factory workers, number of, 261.
"Fathers and Children," Nihilist novel by Tourguéneff, 250, 251.
Feódor Alexéyevich, 66.
Feódor Ivánovich, 63, 64.
Fergana, Central Asian province, 193.
Festival of Bacchus, instituted by Anna Ivánovna, 87.
Finland, ceded to Russia, 106; guaranteed constitutional privileges, 107; constitution of, abrogated, 157.
Finns, 14, 15, 44.
Fioraventi, Italian architect, 61.
"Flagellants," sect, 169, 170.
Fon Vizin, writer of comedies, 243.
Foreigners, attitude of, towards Russia, 59.
Fourteenth century, 50.
Frederikshamn, Treaty of, 106, 180.
"Free Russia," organ of political reform, 225.

Galicia, absorbed by western Europe, 52.
Gellert, imitated, 244.
Geographical features, 7–9; climate, 9, 10; rivers, 10; zones, 10, 11; position in Europe, 59.
Geok-Tepe, Tekké-Turkoman stronghold stormed by Gen. Skóbelev, 194.
Godunóv, Boris, 64.
Gógol, writes against serfdom, 130; novels, 248.
Goldenberg, 151.
Golden Horde, Tatar-Mongol empire, 48.
Golovachév, Gen., 192.
Goncharóv, novelist, 249.
Gordon, Patrick, chief counselor of Peter the Great, 74.
Gortchakóff, Prince, 124; circular to the Powers, 190.
Gourko, Gen., 151, 156.
Government, the *udyélny* system, 30–35, 39; a source of disorder, 40; nature of, 41; princes and grand-princes, 34, 35; gradual change to autocratic system, 45, 46, 50, 51, 53–56; results of change, 57, 58; conditions of, 113, 114.
Grand-prince, duties of, 35.
Great-Russian language, 18, 19, 227–232, 240–242; printed type, 18, 228, 229.
Great-Russians, origin of, 44, 45; future of, 271, 272.
Griboyédov, writer of comedies, 245.
Grinevétsky, kills Alexander Second, 154.
Gunzburg, Sophia, commits suicide, 156.

Hague, Peace Congress at, 158.
Hartmann, 152.
Herat, 197.
Herzen, publicist and littérateur, 131.
Hierarchists, 164.
"High Commission" of Catherine the Great, 97.

"Holy Alliance," 107, 109.
"Holy League," society to combat "Nihilism," 155.
Holy Synod, founded by Peter the Great, 81.
Hunger strikes, 150.

Igor, succeeds Olga, 27; exploits of, celebrated, 234.
Illiteracy, 254.
Individualism of Russian Slavs, 7, 114, 115.
Inertia of official class and peasants, 267.
Irkútsk, 183.
Iván Fifth, 85.
Iván Fourth (the Terrible), a madman on the throne, 55; reign of terror inaugurated by, 55, 56; letters and Kurbsky's history of, 236.
Iván Sixth, 88.
Iván Third (Vassílyevich), 54; destroys independence of the republics, 56.

Jews, persecution of, 173, 174; under educational disabilities, 174.
Jomini, Baron, 197.
"Jumpers," religious sect, 170.

Kamchátka, 184; exile to, 202.
Kántemir, poet, 243.
Karà, flogging of political prisoners at, 156; settlements of, 215; mines and prisons of, 216; evils of convict life at, 217; modern interest in, 217; treatment of exiles at, 217.
Karakázov, 146, 147.
Karamzín, 7, 244; history of Russian empire, 245.
Kaufmann, Gen., 191.
Kaválsky, 150.
Kazán, 108, 146, 286.
Kennan, George, exile system criticised by, 206, 211, 212, 216.
Khabárovsk, 185.
Khaltúrin, 152.
Khárkov, 108.
Khazárs, 14, 15, 23, 24, 26.
Khémnitser, fabulist, 244.
Khiva, 188, 189; campaign against, 191; massacre in the oasis of, by Gen. Kaufmann, 192; annexation of, 192.
Khokand, 189, 190; army of, defeated at Makhram, 193; annexed to Russia, 193.
Kiev, 10, 33, 34; chosen as capital of Russia by Oleg, 26; centre of the old traditions, 42; embellishment of, 42, 43; rivalry of, with Súzdal, 44; fall of, 46.
King of Bells, 61.
Kireyévsky, 234.
Kirghiz, 188, 189.
Knights, round table of, 234.
Knyáz or prince, functions and authority of, 35, 36.
Kossuth, 121.
Kotoshíkhin, 143; writings of, 238.
Kovalevsky, Maxime, 269.
Kreml, of Moscow, 60.
Kropótkin, 151.
Krylóv, fabulist, 245.
Kryzhánich, as exile, 219; writings of, 237, 238.
Kurland, annexation of, 101.
Kuropátkin, Gen., 195.
Kushk, 197.

La Fontaine, imitated, 244.
Language, Russian, origin and affiliations of, as a spoken tongue, 227; alphabet for, invented by Cyrillus, 227, 228; Ecclesiastical Slavonic, 227–229, 240, 241; improvement of Cyrillic characters by Peter the Great, 228, 229; grammatical structure of, and difficulty of acquiring, 230, 231.
Lapukhiná, Evdokía, first wife of Peter the Great, 69; her plot against Peter and punishment, 83.
Law Messenger, 224.
Lefort, Francis, confidential helper of Peter the Great, 74.
Leibnitz, "state councilor" of Russia, 81.
Lérmontov, poetical writings of, 247.
Literature, beginning of, in chronicles and popular writings, 232; popular songs, 232, 233; *bylíny* or epic songs, 233; cycles of Kiev,

Nóvgorod, and Moscow, 234; heroes of the *byliny* 234; the Igor epic, 234, 235; professional singers of, 235; Moscow period of, 236; first printing office in Russia burnt by a mob, 236; influence of the schism on, 237; writings of Kryzhánich, 237; dramatic compositions, 238; works of, in reign of Peter the Great, 238, 239; list of translations into Russian, 239; struggle between Ecclesiastical Slavonic and the language of the people, 240, 241; Lomonósov provides Russia with a literary dialect, 241; life and work of Lomonósov, 242, 243; translations and imitations from the French, 242–244; in the age of Catherine the Great, 243, 244; beginning of, in nineteenth century with Karamzín, 244; advent of Pushkin, 245; poems of Pushkin, 247; writings of Lérmontov, 247; transition from romantic period to realism, 248; busies itself with social problems, 248; Saltykóv, Nekrásov, Dostoyévsky, Goncharóv, Chernishévsky, Ostróvsky, 249; Tourguéneff, 250; Count Leo Tolstóy, 251, 252; dominating motive of realism in, 252, 253.

Lithuania, absorbed by Poland, 52; frees itself from Tatar-Mongol yoke, 48; relations of, with Russia, 62.

Little-Russia, relations of, with Russia, 62; Cossack power abolished in, by Catherine the Great, 101; serfdom introduced into, 126.

Little-Russians, 16.

Lomákin, Gen., defeated by Tekké-Turkomans, 194.

Lomonósov, life and writings of, 242.

London, Treaty of, 124.

Lopukhiná, Princess, punished by Elizabeth Petróvna, 91.

Lord Nóvgorod the Great, 37.

Lutherans, 173.

Madonna, personified by sects, 171.

Manchuria, 186.

Masampho, acquired by Russia, 187.

M. im the Greek, 161.

"May Laws," operation of, 173, 174.

Mélikov, Loris, 151–153.

Mennonites, religious sect, 173.

Ménshikov, collaborator of Peter the Great, 76.

Merv, acquisition of, 196; railroad through, 197.

Mésentsev, Gen., assassinated, 150.

Mikháil Feódorovich, first of the Románovs, 65.

"Milk Drinkers," religious sect, 167, 168, 172.

Miloslávskys, the, 66, 67.

Milyukov, on city populations, 260.

Mir, or village commune, early government in, 24, 26; description of, 134.

Mitau, 85.

Modern Russia, conditions of, 254–262; illiteracy in, 254; agriculture of, 254, 255, 256, 257; peasant and landlord class, 257–259; political conditions of, 255; reaction in the cities of, 259–261; conspiracy among educated classes in, 261, 262; intolerance of race independence by 263; antagonism between different sections of, 263, 264; chances of reform in, 265, 266; alleged inertia of official class and peasants in, 267; coming changes in, 268, 271–273; meaning and prospects of autocracy in, 256, 272, 273.

Molière, translated into Russian, 238.

Moscow (city), settlement of, 51, 52; first prince of, 52; in the 16th century, 60; structural features of, 60, 61; cathedrals of, 61; consolidates autocratic system, 63; Vladislas, the Pole, enthroned in, 64; first Russian printing office in, destroyed by mob, 236.

Moscow (principality), founded by Daniel Alexándrovich, 53; grandprinces of, 53, 54.

Mountains, 9.

Muravióv, "Amúrsky," governor-general of eastern Siberia, 184; acquires territory in northern Asia, 184, 185; obtains the Treaty of Aigun and the surrender of regions on the Amur, 185.

Muraviév, Gen., suppresses the Polish insurrection (1863), 139.
Muraviév, one of the "Decembrists," 220.
"Mutes," religious sect, 165.
"Mystics," religious sect, 169.

Napoleon Buonaparte, 105–107.
Napoleonic wars, 109, 112, 117.
Narva, battle of, 72.
Necháyev, conspiracy of, 147.
Nekrásov, poet, 249.
Nerchinsk, silver mines of, 215.
Nestor, chronicler, 28.
Neva, 10, 110.
Nevélsky, Capt., 185.
Nevsky, Alexander, 52.
Nevsky Prospékt, 81, 110.
Nicholas First, collision of, with the party of reform, 114, 117, 118; conspiracy against, by secret societies, 118; the "Decembrists" and, 118, 119; insurrection in the Square of the Senate quelled by, 119; personal traits of, 119; achievements of, 120; wars of, with Persia and Turkey, 120; Polish insurrection in reign of (1830–31), 120; suppresses the insurrection, 121; intervenes on behalf of Austrian despotism, 121; disaster in the Crimea, 122; death of, 122; instruction concerning Russian flag, 185.
Nicholas Second, accession, 156; dismisses Gen. Gourko, 156; announces that he will protect the principle of autocracy, 157; abrogates the constitution of Finland, 157; proposes to the powers a reduction of armaments, 157, 158; religious prohibitions under, 172, 174.
"Nihilism," origin of term, 140; causes of, 142, 143; as a movement against the ideas of the church and paternal authority, 144; intensified by grievances of professors and students, 145; leads to revolutionary movement, 146; machinations of, combated, 155.
Nikoláyevsk, 185.
Níkon, 161, 162.
Ninth Century, 23, 24, 25.
Nizhny-Nóvgorod, 53.
Nóvgorod (city), 34.
Nóvgorod (republic), 37, 38, 53; resistance of, broken, 55; independence of, destroyed, 56.
Nystadt, Peace of, 180.

Ob, River, 181.
Okhotsk, Sea of, 183, 184.
Old Believers, 161, 162, 164, 172.
Old Bulgarian language, 227, 228.
Oleg, accession, 25; chooses Kiev as his capital, 26, 42.
Olga, first Christian ruler, 27.
Omsk, 188.
Orenburg, settlement of, 188; government of, 189.
Orlóv, Alexéi, favorite of Catherine the Great, 95.
Ostróvsky, writer of comedies, 249.

Pacific, 9.
Palace revolutions, chances of, 265.
Palæologus, Sophia, wife of Iván the Great, 63.
Pale, Jewish, 174.
Pamirs, the, 197.
Panjdih, 197.
"Paradise Lost" translated, 244.
Paris, Treaty of, 123.
Paskiévich, Gen., crushes the Polish patriots (1831), 121.
Paul First, accession, 102; personal traits, 103, 104; murdered, 105.
Peasants and landlord, 257–259.
Peasants, condition of, 112, 113; effect of reforms of Peter the Great on, 116; history of their enslavement, 125–132; extension of serfdom in 18th century, 126; account of serfdom and emancipation, 123–139; delivered from subservience to landowning class, 134; effort to develop disaffection amongst, 147–149.
Pechenégs, 14, 15, 23.
Pechórin, hero of story by Lérmontov, 247.
Pekin, Treaty of, 186.
People, early freedom of, 114; their excessive individualism and inability to coöperate, 114, 115; division of, into educated and politically unan-

bitious, 116, 117; qualities and endowments of, 272.
Perm, republic of, loses its independence, 56.
Peróvskaya, Sophia, connection of, with Moscow train explosion, 152; executed for assassination of Alexander Second, 154.
Peter First (the Great), boyish experiences of, 67, 68; frequents the German suburb, 68; passion of, for boating, 69; takes part in sham fights, 69; campaign against the Turks, 69; journey to western Europe, 70; studies of, abroad, 71; recalled to Russia by the insurrection of the Streltsý, 71; war with Sweden and defeat of Charles Twelfth at Poltáva, 72; foundation of St. Petersburg, 73; friends and assistants of, 74; relations with Catherine, 76, 77; social reforms of, 77; his intemperate habits, 79; substitutes titles gained by service for former classifications of rank, 79; administrative reforms of, 80; reforms army, 80; religious tolerance of, 81; encourages education, 81; end of war with Sweden, 82; second voyage to Europe, 82; treason of Alexéi Petróvich, 82, 83; opposition given to reforms of, by schismatics, 162, 163; history of, by Krekshin, 238.
Petersburg, St., climate of, 10; foundation of, by Peter the Great, 72, 73, 75, 76; chief thoroughfare in, 81; the *Gazette de*, 81; canal from Ladoga to, 88; pomp and structural features of, 110; brilliance of court in, 111.
Peter Second, 84.
Peter Third, accession, 92; marriage of, to Sophia Augusta Frederica (Catherine the Great), 94; unpopularity of, 93; abdicates in favor of his wife and is murdered, 95.
Petróvsk, 185.
Philippians, religious sect, 165.
"Pilgrims," religious sect, 165.
Písemsky, novelist, 250.
Pobyedonóstsev, 173.
Pogódin, 40.
Poland, absorbs Lithuania, 53; alleged conspiracy in favor of, under Iván the Terrible, 55; succession of Auguste Second to throne of, 84, 88; relations of, with Russia, 62; partitions of, 101, 107, 180; kingdom of, revived by Buonaparte, 106; Alexander First becomes king of, 107; granted a constitution, 107; insurrection in (1830-31), 120, 121; Russian reprisals and end of Poland, 121; insurrection in (1863), 139; complete destruction of political autonomy of, 139; Gen. Gourko dismissed from government of, 156.
Poles, 16, 17; seat Vladislas on the throne of Moscow, 64.
Polish conspirators in Siberia, 216.
Polótsky, dramatic writer, 238.
Pólovtsy, 14, 15; campaign against described, 234.
Poltáva, victory of, 72.
Popular Institutions, the *véché*, or folk-mote, 35–38; political power of *véché*, 36; the republic, 35–38; popular assemblies destroyed, 56.
Popular risings, insurrection of Stenko Rázyn, 63; movement against the Poles, 64, 65; Pugachév insurrection, 101.
Population of empire, total, 261; in European Russia, 261; in Asia, 198.
Port Arthur, 186.
Pososhkóv, writings of, 239.
Possessions of Russia, in Asia, 198; difficulties of administering, 199.
Preobrazhénsky, country residence of the Tsars, 66, 69.
Priestless Sects, 163–165.
Principalities of Russia, 53.
Propaganda, movement of, 147, 148.
Proselytism, punishment of, 173.
Pskov, chronicles of, 232.
Pugachév, insurrection led by, 101.
Pushkin, characterization of St. Petersburg by, 73; poems of, 245–247.

Race life in Russia, 263.
Racine, imitation of, 243.
Radíshchev, as exile, 219; writings of, 100, 128, 243, 244.

Railroads, St. Petersburg to Moscow, 120; in Central Asia, 197; through Siberia, 186.
Rank, degrees of, 79.
Raskól. *See* Religion, Church, Dissent, etc.
Reform, chances of, 265, 266.
Religion, rationalism in, 161; Russia, a country of primitive, 174–176; denial of, to culture, 177, 178.
Republics, 35, 38; destruction of, 54, 56.
"Revisor," novel by Gógol, 248.
Revolutionary movement, outbreak of "Decembrists," 118, 119; first martyrs of, 119; begins in "Nihilism" and in imperfect social and political conditions, 140–143; rejection of church dogmas and patriarchal system, 144; proclamation of "central revolutionary committee," 146; Karakásov shoots at the Emperor, 146, 147; Count Tolstóy's scheme for removing discontent, 147; the "going-to-the-people" movement, 148; the administrative system, 149; Viera Sasúlich wounds Trepov and is acquitted, 150; "hunger strikes" in Russian prisons, 150; Gen. Mésentsev assassinated, 150; Alexander Second fired at by Soloviév, 151; plot to kill the Tsar while traveling, 151, 152; explosion at the Winter Palace, 152; Lóris Mélikov made dictator, 153; assassination of Alexander Second, 153, 154; the assassins executed, 154; Mélikov reform proposals shelved by Alexander Third, 154; reactionary policies to combat the revolutionists, 155; the Yakútsk tragedy, 155; flogging to death of Hope Sigida, 156.
Roman Catholics, 173.
Románov, Mikháil Feódorovich, 65.
Románovs, origin of, 64; first of, on the throne, 65; court life of, 111.
Romanóvsky, Gen., 190.
Romodánovsky, confidential helper of Peter the Great, 74.
Rosen, Baron, "Russian conspirators in Siberia," 220.
Rostóv, 44.
Rostóvsky, dramatic writer, 238.
Rurik dynasty, begins, 25; end of, 63, 64.
"Russian Women," poem by Nekrásov, 220.
Russian rulers, Rurik, Oleg, 25, 26; Igor, Olga, Svyatosláv, 27; Vladímir, 28; Yarosláv, 33, 43; Yury Dolgorúky, 51; Alexander Nevsky, 52; Daniel Alexándrovich, 52; Iván Third (Vassílyevich), 36, 55, 56; Iván Fourth (the Terrible), 55, 56; Feódor Ivánovich, 63, 64; Boris Godunóv, 64; Mikháil Feódorovich Románov, 65; Alexéi Mikháilovich, 65, 66; Feódor Alexéyevich, 66; Sophia Alexéyevna, 67; Peter First (the Great), 67–83; Catherine First, 76–83; Anna Ivánovna, 84–88; Anna Leopóldovna, 88; Elizabeth Petróvna, 89–92; Peter Third, 92–95; Catherine Second (the Great), 94–100, 243, 244; Paul First, 102–105; Alexander First, 105–109; Nicholas First, 114–122; Alexander Second, 123–137; Alexander Third, 154–156; Nicholas Second, 156–158.
"Russians," origin of name, 25.
Russian Slavs, origin of, 2, 3; nature worship, 3, 5; social organization, 5, 6; military characters, 6, 7; excessive individualism, 7, 114; migratory habits, 12, 13; agricultural occupations, 13, 14; human environment, 14, 15; intermingling with Finnish, Tatar, and Turkic elements, 15, 16; early history, 23, 24; called "Russi," 25.
Rússkaya Právda ("Russian Right") code of laws, 43.
Rússkoe Bogátstvo, cited from, 209.
Rybnikov, 234.

Saints, 29.
Sakhalín, island of, 185.
Saltykóv, satirist, 249.
Samarkand, 191, 197.
San Stefano, Treaty of, 124.
Sarai, seat of Tatar-Mongol Khans, 48–50.

Sasúlich, Viera, 150.
Scandinavians in Russia, 24–27.
Schism, 159–165.
Schouváloff, 192.
Sebastópol, fall of, 123.
Sects, their solidarity with the revolutionary party, 159, 160; beginning of, in religious schism of 16th century, 160; revision of church books by Nikon, 161; schismatics repudiate the revision, 161; worship of the *raskolniki*, 162; the schism as opposition to the state, 162, 163; severity and tolerance of, by government, 163, 164; divisions of the schism dating from Níkon, 165; general movement of dissent, 166, 167; account of dissenting sects, 167, 171; punishment of dissent, 173.
Selyanínovich, personification of agriculture, 233.
Serfdom, story of, 125–132; extension of in 17th and 18th century, 126; deporting of slaves to the mines, 127; forced labor in, 127; protest against, by Radíshchev, 100, 128, 243, 244; decrees of Paul and Alexander First, 28; first experiment in emancipation, 129; reform of, on the banner of the Decembrists, 129, 130; views of Nicholas First concerning, 130; criticisms of, by Shchedrín, Gogol, and Tourguéneff, 130, 131; Herzen's polemic against, 131, 132; causes favoring abolition of, 132; final legislative action against and decree of emancipation, 132–134; institution of the mir reëmphasized, 134; news of emancipation, how received, 135, 136; redemption of land made compulsory, 133; total number of slaves released from, 133, 134.
Seventeenth century, 66; religious revolt in, 159–166.
Shchedrín, satirist, writes against serfdom, 130.
Siberia, discovery of, by Yermák, 181, 182; Cossacks reach the Pacific, 183; Muraviév made governor-general of eastern Siberia, 184; Muraviév's schemes for the acquirement of northern Asia, 184; founds Petróvsk, Nikoláyevsk, Blagovéshchensk, and Khabárovsk, 185; obtains the treaty of Aigun and the cession of territory in the Amur, 185; Gen. Ignatiev, by Treaty of Pekin, obtains Manchuria, 186; adequate railway system authorized for, 186; description of the system, 186; cession of Port Arthur, Talien-Wan, and Masampho to Russia, 186, 187; description of, 201, 202.
Siberian exile, deportations of "politicals" during the revolutionary movement, 149; system of, begins, 203; first batch of exiles, 203; inadequacy of exile system, 204; route taken by exile marching parties, 204; exiles' begging song, 205; systematization and improvement of, 205; *étape* houses erected, 206; classes of exiles, 206; number of exiles deported, 207–209; convicts on Island of Sakhalín, 207; voluntary exiles (women and children), 207, 208; percentage of political offenders, 208; numbers exiled by "administrative process," 208, 209; reports of prison commissions on exile system, 208; evils of, 209–219; prisons of European Russia, 209; Tiumén forwarding prison, 209–212; transference to Tomsk by convict barges, 209, 211, 212; conveyance from Tomsk to Irkútsk, 212, 213; order of the march, 213; description of the *étape* and *polu-étape* houses, 214; demoralization produced by system of, 214; banishment for loss of passport, 214; hardships of the road, 215; character of hospital accommodations, 215; silver mines of Nerchinsk, 215, 216; life of convicts at Karáa, 216; Karáa death rate, 217; punishments at Karáa, 217; hunger strikes and suicides, 217, 218; exiles under police surveillance, 218, 219; distinguished persons condemned to, 219–222; statements by humble victims of, 223, 224; official objections to,

225; preliminary measures for abolition of, 226.
Siberian railroad, 186.
Sibir, city of, 182.
"Sighers," religious sect, 170.
Sigida, Hope, flogged to death, 156.
Sir Darya basin, acquired by Russia, 191.
Sixteenth century, 60, 61.
Skóbelev, Gen., 194–197.
Slav nature worship, 3, 4, 5.
Sobors, or national assemblies, 268–270.
Sochaczewski, Alexander, 204.
Soloviév, historian, 27, 151.
Sophia Alexéyevna, daughter of Alexéi Mikháilovich, 67.
State, opposition to, by religious reformers, 162.
Stenko Razyn leads insurrection, 126.
Streltsý, insurrection and extermination of, 71; history of insurrection by Matvéyev, 238.
Stróganov, family of, 182.
Stundists, religious sect, 168, 172.
Sumarókov, dramatic writer, 243.
Sutáyev, evangelist, 171.
Suvórov, Gen., campaigns in western Europe, 102, 103.
Súzdal, 34, 44, 50; rivalry with Kiev, 45, 53; chronicles of, 232.
Svyatogór, mythical hero, 233.
Svyatosláv, 27.
Swedes defeated by Alexander Nevsky, 52.

Ta-Lien-wan, 186.
Tashkent, 189, 197.
Tatar-Mongols, invasion and domination of Russia by, 47; period of yoke imposed by, 48; chiefs of Mongol nation in Asia, 48; end of "yoke," 48; character of "yoke," 48–50; payment of tribute to, 50; modification of Russian life by, 50.
Tatíshchev, history of Russia by, 243.
Taylor, Bayard, characterizations of Russian empire by, 23, 263.
Tekké-Turkomans, 193; defense of Geok-Tepe by, 194; storming of the fortress of, by Skóbelev, 194, 195; massacre of, 195.
Theodosians, religious sect, 165.
Tiumén, forwarding prison, 209–211.
Tobacco permitted in Russia, 79.
Tobólsk, 182, 206.
Tolstóy, Count Leo, novelist, religious and social views of, 171; describes party of exiles in "Resurrection," 214.
Tolstóy, Count Dmitry A., minister of public instruction, 147.
Tomsk, 223; forwarding prison of, 212.
Torture, under the criminal code, 38; by Iván Vassílyevich and Iván the Terrible, 54–56; by Peter the Great, 71, 83.
Tourguéneff, writings against serfdom 130, 131; relation to "Nihilism," 140; as novelist, 250.
Transcaspia, military district, 194.
Treaties, Nystadt, 82, 180; China, 84; Abo, 92; Aix-la-Chapelle, 92; Tilsit, 105; Frederikshamn, 106, 180; Vienna (1814), 107; Holy Alliance, 107; Paris (1856), 123; San Stefano, 124; London (1871), 124; Berlin (1878), 124; Bukharest, 180; Nerchinsk, 184; Aigun, 185; Pekin, 186.
Tredyakóvsky, conspirator, 243.
Trépov, Gen., 150.
Trubetskóy, Catherine, 220.
Trubetskóy, conspirator, 220.
Tsebrikóva, Madame, punishment of, 156.
Tver, republic of, absorbed by Russia, 56; provincial assembly of, 158; chronicles of, 232.
Twelfth century, 40.

Udyélny system, 30–35, 40, 41–43, 46, 50; functions of prince under, 34, 35; settlement by conquest and colonization under, 179.
Uniats, religious body, 173.
Ussuri, 185, 186.

Valdái, mountain range, 9.
Varyágs, Scandinavian origin of, 24; invitation extended to, 25; Varyág administration of Russia by, 25–27.
Véché, or folkmote, 35–38; broken up, 56.

Verévkin, Gen., 191.
Vienna, Treaty of, 107.
Village industries, 261.
Viluisk, Chevnishévsky exiled to, 221, 222.
Vladímir, champions Christianity, 28; exploits of, celebrated in *byliny*, 235; beautifies Kiev, 42, 43.
Vladímir (city), 44, 51, 54; official residence of Bogolyúbsky, 46.
Vladivostók, 186.
Volga, 10.
Volhynia, chronicles of, 232.
Vorotínsky burnt by Iván the Terrible, 56.
Vyátka, republic of, 37; absorbed by Russia, 56.

"War and Peace," novel by Tolstóy, 251.
Wars, with Sweden, 72, 75, 82, 91, 101; Turks, 69, 88, 101, 124; France, 88; Prussia, 92, 102, 106; Persia, 101; Great Britain, 103; against the Hungarians, 121; Crimean War, 122.
Warsaw, bombardment of, 121.
"What 's to be Done?" novel by Chernishévsky, 249.
Winter Palace, feature of St. Petersburg, 110; explosion in, 152; Alexander Second carried to, 154.
Wolkhónsky, 220.
Women, emancipation of, by Peter the Great, 77; condition of, under Domostróy, 142-144; women's question, 144.
Wrasskóy, Galkin, report on Siberian lazarets, 215.

Yakútsk, 183; massacre at, 155.
Yaroslávl (ruler), 33, 40, 62; embellishes Kiev, 43.
Yaroslávl (city), 44.
Yeneséisk, 183.
Yermák, 181, 182.
Yomuds, extermination of, 192.

Zaandam, voyage of Peter the Great to, 69, 70.
Zabaikál, 205.
Zémstva, or provincial assemblies, 136.
Zhukovsky, poet, 245.

Boston Public Library
3 9999 10503 045 4